SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE SILVER JUBILEE VOLUMES.

SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE SILVER JUBILEE VOLUMES

VOL. III

ORIENTALIA—Part 3

निन्दन्तु नीतिनिपुणा यदि वा स्तुवन्तु
लक्ष्मीः समाविशतु गच्छतु वा यथेष्टम् ।
अद्यैव वा मरणमस्तु युगान्तरे वा
न्याय्यात्पथः प्रविचलन्ति पदं न धीराः ॥

Alma terra natia,
La vita che desti ecco ti rendo.—*Leopardi.*
[My country, dear Motherland,
The life thou gavest me, behold, I now restore.]

CALCUTTA

PUBLISHED BY THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY AND PRINTED AT THE
CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1927

PRINTED BY BHUPENDRALAL BANERJEE AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS,
SENATE HOUSE, CALCUTTA

TO

THE HONOURABLE SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE, KT., C.S.I.,

ON THE OCCASION OF THE SILVER JUBILEE OF HIS ATTAINING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA, THIS VOLUME OF ESSAYS CONTRIBUTED BY HIS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS IN INDIA AND ABROAD IS INSCRIBED WITH AFFECTION, RESPECT AND GRATITUDE FOR HIS SPLENDID SERVICES TO THE CAUSE OF THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING.

1894-1919

A. M.*

[25th May, 1924]

Farewell, great Worker ! Dreamer of great dreams
Who dared to gaze back in the depths profound
Of India's glorious past ; who sought and found,
In our beloved Motherland, the streams
Of Holy Ganga, that from Śiva's hair
Descending, offered draughts of Wisdom rare
To thirsting souls of men. Now underground
This Ganga flows : how drag her out once more
To surface, whereby, as in days of yore,
Our land become a place of pilgrimage,—
This was the only thought that did engage
Each moment of thy life. God-giv'n thy store
Of gifts thou didst for India freely pour ;
Come back,—for Service greater than before.

* Reproduced with permission from the *Calcutta Review*, July, 1924.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

1. The Principles and Methods of Taxation in Ancient India :
Panchanandas Mukherji, M.A., I.E.S. (Offg.), F.R.E.S., Professor of Economics and Political Science, Presidency College, Calcutta, Lecturer in Economics, University of Calcutta ... 1

2. Some Economic Teachings from the Mahābhārata :
J. N. Samaddar, B.A., F.R.Hist.S., Professor of History, Patna College, Patna 15

3. Buddhism in Khotan : its Decline according to two Tibetan Accounts :
Dr. F. W. Thomas, M.A., Ph.D., Librarian, India Office, London 30

4. The Early Oriya Writers :
B. C. Mazumdar, B.A., B.L., Lecturer in Comparative Philology, Oriya, and Cultural Anthropology, University of Calcutta ... 53

5. The Historical Beginnings of Jainism :
Dr. Prabodhchandra Bagchi, M.A., D.ès Let. (Paris), Lecturer in Ancient Indian History and Chinese, University of Calcutta ... 71

6. Introduction to the History of Early Buddhist Schools :
Ryukan Kimura, Lecturer in Indian Buddhist History and Mahāyāna Philosophy, University of Calcutta 87

7. Sindhi Language and Literature :
Khan Bahadur Kalicbeg F. Mirza, Retired Deputy Collector, Hyderabad, Sind ... 129

PAGE.

8. Present Day Monastic Life in Ceylon :
Rev. R. Siddhartha, M.A., Lecturer in Pali and Sinhalese, University of Calcutta 139

9. Mahāyāna in the Making :
Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.), Professor of Pali, University of Calcutta ... 163

10. Bammera Potanamatya :
K. Rangachari, M.A., Lecturer in Telugu, University of Calcutta 181

11. The Date of Sri-Candra :
R. D. Banerji, M.A., Superintendent, Archæological Survey of India, Western Circle, Poona 210

12. Nawab Shaifta :
Lala Sri Ram Saheb, M.A., Delhi. (Translated from the original Urdu by Syed Amir Ali, M.A.) 223

13. Faith in Buddhism :
Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.), Professor of Pali, University of Calcutta ... 237

14. The Place of Urdu in the Indian Vernaculars :
Abdul Majid, B.A., M.R.A.S., Fellow of the Osmania University of Hyderabad, Deccan ... 257

15. Fakirmohan Senapati :
Lakshmikanta Chaudhuri, M.A., Professor of Sanskrit, Ravenshaw College, Cuttack ... 274

16. Modern Bengali Literature; a Study of its Growth and of its chief Features :
Sasankamohan Sen, B.L., Lecturer in Bengali, University of Calcutta 285

17. Bendiganavale Venkatachariar; his Life and Works :
P. Appaji Rao, B.Sc., Lecturer in Kanarese, University of Calcutta 313

PAGE.

18. Viṣṇu's Three Strides :
Dr. R. Samasastri, M.A., D.Lit., M.R.A.S., Curator, Government Library, Mysore ... 329

19. Rasa Cult in the Chaitanya Charitāmṛta :
Dr. Abhaykumar Guha, M.A., B.L., Ph.D., Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Calcutta 368

20. The City Beautiful (a Tamil Panegyric Lyric) :
C. P. Venkataram Aiyar, M.A., L.T., Head Master, Government Secondary Training School, Saidapet, Madras 389

21. Is not 'Pure Self' Active in the Vedanta System ?
Kokileswar Sastri, M.A., Lecturer in Sanskrit and Hindu Philosophy, University of Calcutta 397

22. On some Passages of the Harṣacarita of Bāṇa :
Sitanath Pradhan, M.Sc., Demonstrator in Physics, Murarichand College, Sylhet ... 423

23. On Some Early References to the Kautilya Arthaśāstra :
Dr. J. Jolly, Ph.D., M.D., D.C.L. (Oxon.), Professor of Sanskrit, University of Würzburg, Tagore Law Professor (1883), University of Calcutta 431

24. On Four Musalmāni Folk-songs from the District of Chittagong in Eastern Bengal :
Saratchandra Mitra, M.A., B.L., Corresponding Member of the Anthropological Society of Bombay, Lecturer in Anthropology, University of Calcutta 437

25. Some Moslem Writers in Hindi :
Gangapati Singh, B.A., Tanknath Chaudhuri Lecturer in Maithili, University of Calcutta... 447

PAGE.

26. Sāyana's Commentary—its Composition :
Dr. P. D. Gune, M.A. (Bom.), Ph.D. (Leipzig), Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona 467

27. Malabari's Poetry :
Dr. Irach J. S. Taraporewala, B.A., Ph.D., Bar.-at-Law, Professor of Comparative Philology, University of Calcutta 477

28. Noun Declension in the Buddha-Gān :
Muhammad Shahidullah, M.A., B.L., Lecturer in Bengali, University of Dacca 509

29. Buddha-Kāya as an Idea ; the Historical Study of its Origin and Growth :
Ryukan Kimura, Lecturer in Indian Buddhist History and Mahāyāna Philosophy, University of Calcutta 523

The Contents arranged subject-wise :

(The numbers are those indicated in the table above)

Ancient India :

(*a*) History : 11.
(*b*) Mythology : 18.
(*c*) Politics and Political Institutions : 1, 2, 23.

Bengali : 16, (also 19, 24).
Buddhism : 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 29.
Ethnology : 24.
Gujrāti : 27.
Hindi : 25.
Jainism : 5.
Kanarese : 17.
Oriya : 4, 15.
Philology : 28.
Philosophy and Religion : 19, 21.
Sanskrit Language and Literature : 22, 26, (also 23).
Sindhi : 7.
Tamil : 20.
Telugu : 10.
Urdu : 12, 14.

THE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF TAXATION IN ANCIENT INDIA.

PANCHANANDAS MUKHERJI, M.A., I.E.S. (Offg.) F.R.E.S.

Professor of Economics and Political Science, Presidency College, Calcutta, Lecturer, Calcutta University.

In Hindu India of bygone days the activities of the State took manifold forms. The long list of superintendents given in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* (e.g. superintendents of mines, of metals, of ocean mines, of salt, of gold, of commerce, of forest produce, of the armoury, of tolls, of weaving, of agriculture, of ships, of cows, horses and elephants, of pasture lands, etc.) clearly indicates the nature and range of the multifarious functions undertaken by the State. Thus, according to Kauṭilya, the king is expected to carry on mining operations and manufactures, exploit timber and elephant-forests, offer facilities for commerce and cattle-breeding, construct roads for traffic, both by land and water, and set up market towns; he is also expected to "exercise his right of ownership with regard to fishing, ferrying and trading in vegetables"; he is to provide the orphans, the aged, the infirm, the afflicted and the helpless with maintenance, protect the interests of agriculture and agriculturists, make provision for pasture grounds on uncultivable tracts, and so on. The proper performance of all these functions presupposes the existence of a well-filled treasury; and Kauṭilya is careful to inculcate the sound doctrine that "all undertakings depend upon finance; hence foremost attention should be paid to the treasury."

A well-filled treasury presupposes a well-ordered system of taxation which, again, must be based on certain fundamental principles—the principles of equality, certainty,

convenience and economy: it should distribute the burden fairly, each tax should yield revenue without waste or needless cost, and the system should be such that the contributors should know approximately what they are paying. These principles have been expressed in the classical formulæ of Adam Smith, viz.:—

1. The subjects of every state ought to contribute towards the support of the government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities, i.e., in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state.
2. The tax which each individual is bound to pay, ought to be certain, and not arbitrary. The form of payment, the manner of payment, the quantity to be paid, ought all to be clear and plain to the contributor, and to every other person.
3. Every tax ought to be levied at the time or in the manner, in which it is likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it.
4. Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and to keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state.

These maxims inculcating equality, certainty, convenience and economy were not unknown to Hindu writers. Analogues of these principles abound in all the old Hindu texts. The maxims quoted below are suggestive of Adam Smith's first principle, and indicate that taxes ought not to be oppressively high, that they should be proportioned to the ability of the subjects to pay, and that they should not be heavy enough to destroy the tax-payer's productive capacity altogether. Thus Śukrāchārya says, "the king should receive rent from the peasant in such a way that he be not destroyed. It is to be realized in the fashion of the weaver of the garland,

not of the coal merchant"[1] apparently because the coal merchant sets fire to the woods to make charcoal and thus destroys the whole property, whereas the weaver of garlands plucks from the trees only those flowers which are full-blown and preserves the rest as well as the trees for future use. In the *Śānti Parva* of the *Mahābhārata* the idea finds expression in the following couplets :

(*a*) "Taking note of the sales and the purchases, the state of the roads, the food and the dress, and the stocks and profits, of those that are engaged in trade, the king should levy taxes on them."

(*b*) "Ascertaining on all occasions the extent of the manufactures, the receipts and expenses of those that are engaged in them, and the state of the arts, the king should levy taxes upon the artisans in respect of the arts they follow."

(*c*) "The king may take high taxes, but he should never levy such taxes as would emasculate his people."

Adam Smith's second principle finds its echo in the following text of the *Mahābhārata*[2]: "The king should impose taxes gradually and with conciliation, in proper season (*yathākālam*) and according to due form (*yathāvidhi*)." The words clearly indicate the existence of prescribed formalities previously known to the taxpayer. All the Hindu writers have carefully laid down the minute fractions and proportions of the various kinds of commodities that have to be paid by the various classes of persons and have vividly described the method and procedure of making such payments of the king. It is clearly evident that everybody was certain as to what tax he was to pay, how he was to pay, and when he was to pay. There were the Collector-General, the Chamberlain, the Superintendents of Accounts, of Store-house, of Commerce,

[1] *Śukranīti*, 222-223.

[2] *Śānti*, lxxvii, 12.

etc., with minute and definite instructions regarding the form, method and procedure of taxation. There can be no question, therefore, that Adam Smith's principle of certainty was clearly understood and acted upon by the Hindu financiers.

The third principle of convenience was also not unknown to the Hindu writers on public finance. Thus in the *Mahābhārata* it is clearly stated that "the king should never impose taxes unseasonably."[3] Again, we find the positive dictum that "the king should take wealth from his subjects at the proper time."[4] The tax was to be realized in such a way that the tax-payer "may not feel the pressure of want"; the convenience of the tax-payer as regards the time and manner of payment was thus a matter of great concern to the Hindu writers.

The fourth canon of Adam Smith—the canon of economy, a canon which can only be acted upon by a highly efficient administration—points to productiveness as the fundamental fact in taxation. The aim is revenue, and in its acquisition the productive powers of the community are not to be reduced, i.e. taxation should be so arranged as not to diminish the efficiency of land, labour or capital. This principle was also operative in the Hindu scheme of taxation under which no tax was to injure the source or to reduce capital or to cause harrassment to traders. The following texts well illustrate this principle:

(*a*) "The king should receive rent from the peasant in such a way that he be not destroyed."[5]

(*b*) "No tax should be levied without ascertaining the the outturn and amount of labour that has been necessary to produce it."[6]

[3] *na cāsthāne na cākāle karam tebhyo* nipātayet (loc. cit.)

[4] *Śānti*, cxx, 33.

[5] *Śukranīti*, loc. cit.

[6] *Śānti*, lxxxvii, 15.

(c) "After due consideration the king shall always fix in his realm the duties and taxes in such a manner that both he himself and the man who does not work receive their due reward."[7]

The Hindu system of taxation was not only based on sound principles: but it also contained a well thought-out scheme of exemptions, remissions and gradation of taxes. "Though dying with want," so runs Manu's strict injunction, "a king must not levy a tax on *Śrotriyas*."[8] "Those who perform sacrifices (*Ṛtvik*), spiritual guides, priests and those learned in the Vedas shall be granted *Brahmadāya* lands yielding sufficient produce and exempted from taxes and fines." The Brāhmaṇas were not only exempted from taxes and fines, but they were under the special protection of the king and the community. They were like Plato's Guardians—free from worldly cares and anxieties—always devoted to cultural and religious pursuits. As Viṣṇu says, "the king must not tax the Brāhmaṇas, for they pay the tax already in the shape of *dharmācāra*, i.e. the king shares with them their merit of performing religious rites and sacrifices."[9] The king was to see that in his kingdom no *Śrotriya* pined for hunger; he was to give them land yielding sufficient produce for their maintenance; he was to provide them "with forests for *soma* plantation, and for the performance of penance, such forests being rendered safe from dangers from animate and inanimate objects, and being named after the tribal name (*gotra*) of the Brāhmaṇas resident therein". This benevolent attitude of the State towards the Brāhmaṇas is of great significance. These Brāhmaṇas were the repositories of the best cultural traditions of the race, and their comparative freedom from worldly cares enabled them to devote their whole time to the development

[7] *Manu*, vii, 128.
[8] Ibid, 133.
[9] *Viṣṇu*, iii, 13.

of original ideas and their transmission through the *Brahmacāris* under their care: they were the recognized teachers and leaders of thought; and every *Śrotriya's* home was an academy of learning from which bands of scholars went forth into the world carrying the torch of learning far and wide.

It cannot be said that the State was partial to the privileged class of Brāhmaṇas: for the Hindu scheme of exemptions and remissions extended to other classes as well. Thus Manu enjoins: "A blind man, an idiot, a cripple who moves with the help of a crutch, a man full seventy years old and he who confers benefits on *Śrotriyas* shall not be compelled by any king to pay a tax".[10] There is an element of large-hearted humanity in this injunction which one misses in most modern schemes of taxation. A similar spirit animates the rule requiring mechanics, artisans and Śūdras who subsist by manual labour to work for the king one day in each month[11] or according to Sukrācārya, once in a fortnight. The following texts also clearly show that, in taxing the people, the king was not merely the tax-gatherer but also the protector of the interests of the people—

(*a*) "If a people undertake new industries or cultivate new lands, and dig tanks, canals, wells etc for their good, the king should not demand any thing of them until they realise profit twice the expenditure."[12]

(*b*) "Having well considered the rates of purchase and of sale, the length of the road, the expenses, for food and condiments, the charges for securing the goods, let the king make the trader pay duty".

[10] *Manu*, vii, 394.

[11] *Manu*, viii, 130; cf. also शिल्पिनः कर्मजीविनश्च शूद्रश्च मासेनैकं राज्ञः कर्म कुर्युः (*Viṣṇu*, iii 17.).

[12] *Śukranīti*, 942-248.

(c) "Take care, O King, that the traders in thy kingdom who purchase articles at prices high and sell low, and who, in course of their journeys, have to sleep or take rest in forests and inaccessible regions be not afflicted by the imposition of heavy taxes."[13]

(d) "Commodities intended for marriage, or taken by a bride from her parent's house to her husband's house or taken for the purpose of sacrificial performance, confinement of women, worship of gods, investiture of sacred thread etc. shall be let off free of toll."[14]

I may in this connection, refer to two verses in the *Śānti Parva*[15], which wonderfully reveal the idea of progressive taxation: "a little by little should be taken from a growing subject and by this means should he be shorn: the demand should then be increased gradually till what is taken assumes a fair proportion. The king should enhance the burthens of his subjects gradually like a person gradually increasing the burthen of a young bullock."[15]

The object of taxation is said to be "the necessity that exists for protecting the people and enabling them to assure the means of living in peace;"[16] taxes are imposed "in return for the protection granted to them";[17] "the king should take a sixth part of the incomes of his subjects as tribute for meeting the expenses of protecting them." It will be evident, therefore, that with the Hindu writers, taxes were the price paid by the people for the protection which they received at the hands of the king. The word "protection" however, has a much wider connotation than what we ordinarily mean by it; it includes not merely the negative function of prevention, but

[3] *Śānti*, lxxxix,23.
[4] *Artha.*, ii, 21, (p. 111, 2nd ed.)
[5] *Śānti*, lxxxvii, 6-7.
[6] *Śānti*, lxxxvii, 35.
[7] *Śānti*, lxxi, 10.

it also includes diverse positive functions; "protection" included a well thought-out programme of state activities calculated to help the people in achieving the fourfold end of *dharma, artha, kāma, moksha;* and taxes were so distributed over a wide range, and schemes of remissions and suspensions were so devised that each man could, under the protecting wings of the State, pursue his chosen end unmolested and unhindered, and at the same time could contribute his mite towards its development. When some classes of the people were exempted from taxation, and when the variety of taxes was as great as the activities of individuals, it was but natural that the notion of taxes being the equivalent given by citizens for the protection they enjoyed individually from the state should widely prevail; and that is the reason why there was such a bewildering variety of taxes and tolls apprently to suit the convenience of individuals of various classes. The modern ideas of equality and common good were not quite developed, and so the modern conception of a few productive taxes imposed on all without any distinction of caste, class or creed did not find favour with the Hindu writers.

Under the Hindu kings of ancient India there was a complex variety of taxes and tolls realized generally in kind, sometimes in cash, and, in some cases, in both cash and kind. Thus, there were taxes on traders, agriculturists, manufacturers, miners, shopkeepers, cattle-owners, artisans, goldsmiths etc. The following text of the *Mahābhāratha* gives a general description of some of the main items of taxation—

"With a sixth part, upon fair calculation, of the yield of the soil as his tribute, with fines and forfeitures levied upon offenders, with the imposts according to Scriptures upon merchants and traders in return for the protection granted to them, a king should fill his treasury." This and similar other texts point to a share in the produce of all cultivated land as being the principal source of the king's

revenue. Excepting a couplet quoted by Bhaṭṭasvāmin in his commentary on the *Arthaśāstra*[18] there is scarcely any authority for regarding the king as the owner of the land. The couplet referred to is as follows: "Those who are well-versed in the *Śāstras* admit that the king is the owner of both land and water and that the people can exercise their right of ownership over all other things excepting these two." In spite of this authority on their side, however, the Hindu kings did not claim ownership of the land, but they were content with a fixed share of the produce of the land for the services they rendered to the state. As regards the extent of the state share the general view is that the share was one-sixth of the gross produce, i.e. of the grain-heap made up on the threshing floor; and Manu notices that the sixth might be raised to one-fourth in time of war or of other emergency. In the *Śukranīti,* however, we find different proportions prescribed for lands of different qualities. Thus Śukrācārya says: "Having ascertained the amount of produce from the measured plots of land, whether great, middling or small, the king should desire revenue, and then apportion it among them "[19]. Again, we find it stated that "the king should realise a third, a fourth or a half from places which are irrigated by tanks, by canals and wells, by rains and rivers respectively." It is only in the case of the produce from barren and rocky soil that Sukrācārya prescribes the sixth share.

The land-tax was the chief, but not the only source, of revenue, and this is clear from the text of the *Mahābhārata* quoted above. I shall quote here a few other texts giving an account of the various other imposts. Let us first turn to Gautama, one of the early Hindu law-givers. He says: "Cuitivators must pay to the king a tax (amounting to), one-tenth, one-eighth or one-sixth (of the produce). Some

18 Referred to by Dr. Shama Shastri in his Eng. trans. of the *Arthaśāstra* (p. 144).

19 *Śukranīti*, 220-221.

declare that (there is a tax) also on cattle and gold, viz., one-fiftieth. In the case of merchandise, one-twentieth was the duty, and of roots, fruits, flowers, medicinal herbs, honey, meat, grass and fire-wood, one-sixtieth." Manu gives a longer list of articles on which taxes were to be levied, he says: "A fiftieth part of the increments on cattle, and gold may be taken by the king, and the eighth, sixth or twelfth part of the crops. He may also take the sixth part of trees, meat, honey, clarified butter, perfumes, medicinal herbs, substances used for flavouring food, flowers, roots and fruits, of leaves, pot, herbs, grass, objects made of cane, skins, of earthen vessles, and all articles made of stone." Elsewhere Manu enjoins, "let the king take one-twentieth of that amount which men, well acquainted with the settlement of tolls and duties and skilful in estimating the value of all kinds of merchandise, may fix as the value for each saleable commodity."

In the *Śukranīti*, we find a carefully drawn up scheme of taxation. We have already referred to the share of produce which, according to Śukrācārya, falls to the lot of the king. The way in which this share was realized is remarkably modern. Having divided the whole land into several proprietorships the king was to collect the revenue from and through one man who was to be held responsible for the total dues of the village. The king was to realise, according to Śukrācārya, from minerals at the following rates: $\frac{1}{2}$ of gold, $\frac{1}{3}$ of silver, $\frac{1}{4}$ of copper, $\frac{1}{6}$ of zinc and iron, $\frac{1}{3}$ of gems, $\frac{1}{2}$ of glass and lead, after the expenses had been met. He was to realise $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{5}$, $\frac{1}{7}$, $\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{20}$ from the collectors of grasses and woods, etc. He was to have $\frac{1}{8}$ of the increase of goats, sheep, cows, buffaloes and horses, and $\frac{1}{16}$ of the milk of she-buffaloes, she-goats and female sheep The king was to share $\frac{1}{32}$ portion of the usurer's interest; this must have added considerably to the kings' revenues, as the rates of interest have been proverbially high in all periods of Indian economic history. He was also to receive

rents from houses and abodes as from cultivated lands; land for houses and buildings was also to be taxed at the same rate as that for cultivators; land for stalls also was to be taxed; the sellers had to pay duties not only for the commodities sold but also for the use of the land.

It is in Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, however, that we have the most detailed account of the scheme of taxation in ancient India. The following sources of revenue are mentioned in Chapter VI of Book II of the *Arthaśāstra*—forts (*durga*), country parts (*rāṣṭra*), mines (*khani*), buildings and gardens (*setu*), forests (*vana*), herds of cattle (*vraja*) and roads of traffic (*vaṇikpatha*). Income from "forts" included, among other things, (*a*) excise duties levied on certain articles made of precious metals, (*b*) taxes on mercantile ware-houses, corporations of artisans and handicraftsmen, and temples and places of worship, (*c*) tolls collected at the city gates and (*d*) fines on gamblers and prostitutes. The income from "country parts" consisted mainly of the produce from crown lands (*sīta*), the share of the portion of produce payable to the Government (*bhāga*), minor taxes assessed on the use of land and water, tolls paid by boats and ships, and road cesses (*vārtāni*),[20] "for the preservation and repair of streets, the king should have dues from those who use the roads". The income from "mines" was derived from shares of gold, silver, diamonds, gems, pearls, corals, conch-shells, iron, salt, and other minerals extracted from plains and mountain slopes. Flower-gardens, fruit gardens, vegetable gardens, etc., yielded their share of revenue (*setu*) to the king in the shape of fruits, vegetales, yield of fisheries, etc. The "forest revenue" was derived from the lease of forest land for game-hunting, and from the sale of timber and elephants. The king had also a share in any increase in the number of cows, buffaloes, goats, sheep, asses, camels, horses, and mules

[20] *Śukranīti*, iv, 11, 258.

owned by private individuals. The tolls payable by merchants on land and water routs formed an important source of income. "Merchandise, external (*bāhyam*, i.e. arriving from country parts), internal (*ābhyantaram*, i.e. manufactured inside forts), or foreign (*ātithyam*, i.e. imported from foreign countries) shall all be liable to the payment of toll alike when exported (*niṣkrāmya*) and imported (*praveśyam*). Imported commodities shall pay a fifth of their value as toll." It is interesting to note in this connection, that importers of foreign merchandise were exempted from the payment of other trade taxes, so that they might derive some profit.[21] All the above items form, according to Kauṭilya, the body of the king's revenues (*āyaśarīram*). In another part of the *Arthaśāstra*[22] we find a more careful enumeration of the sources of the king's revenue which may broadly be divided under two heads, viz. (1) taxes and benevolences, and (2) non-tax revenue. Under the first head the following sources are mentioned—(*a*) fixed taxes (*piṇḍakara*), (*b*) taxes that are paid in the form of a sixth of the produce (*ṣaḍbhāga*), (*c*) levy of provisions for the army (*senābhakta*), (*d*) religious taxes (*bali*), (*e*) taxes or subsidies paid by vassal kings and others (*kara*), (*f*) presentations made to the king on the birth of a prince (*utsaṅga*), (*g*) royalties (*pārśva*), (*h*) grain compensations levied for damages done by cattle on crops that grow on uncultivated lands (*pārihīṇika*), (*i*) presents (*aupāyanika*), and rents of public buildings (*kauṣṭheyaka*). The other head comprising sources of non-tax revenue inchudes, among other things, (*a*) the agricultural produce of crown lands (*sīta*), (*b*) commerce (*krayīma*), (*c*) grains obtained by special request (*pramityaka,*) (*d*) manufacture of rice, oils etc., by the state (*simhanika*), (*e*) accidental revenue from escheats, confiscations etc., (*anyajāta*), (*f*) investments and savings from estimated outlay (*vyayapratyaya*) and (*g*) recovery of past arrears (*upasthānam*).

[21] *Artha*, ii, 16 (p. 98, 2nd ed.) [22] *Artha*, ii, 15 (p. 23 2nd. ed.).

As the majority of the taxes were paid in kind, elaborate arrangements were necessary for storing the produce and selling it for the king. There was therefore, the Treasurer-General (*Sannidhātā*), whose duty it was to see to the construction of the treasury house, the trading house, the storehouse of grains, the storehouse of forest produce, etc. Detailed instructions are given in the *Arthaśāstra* for the distribution and sale of the king's merchandise at home and abroad. Those who sell the merchandise of the king were required to "put their sale proceeds in a wooden box kept in a fixed place and provided with a single aperture on the top. During the eighth part of the day, they were to submit to the Superintendent the sale report, saying how much has been sold and how much remains".[23] Arrangements were also made for the sale of the king's merchandise in foreign countries to see if there were a margin of profit in the sale transaction.

It is but natural that under such a complex system of taxation like that described above, there should be an army of officials under the two great officers of State the Collector-General (*Saṁhartā*), and the Chamberlain (*Sannidhātā*). The complexity of the tax-system undoubtedly placed numerous impediments on production and trade, and although the principles were sound, in its practical working, it probably caused some degree of waste, uncertainty and, possibly, inequality of incidence. If we have a great number of small taxes, the interference with freedom, the complexity of legislation, and the cost of collection become great compared with the revenue raised. The Hindu theorists apparently never thought of any single tax scheme like that propounded by Henry George; they rather agreed with Arthur Young in maintaining that "a good system of taxation is one that bears lightly on an infinite number of points, heavily on none". More than one text could be quoted in

[23] *Artha.* ii, 16 (p. 28, 2nd ed.)

support of the Hindu conception of the dissipation of the taxes or of unconsciousness of its burden. I shall conclude this brief thesis by quoting two characteristic texts bearing on this point:—

(*a*) "As the leech, the calf and the bee take their food little by little, even so must the king draw from his realm moderate annual taxes."[24]

(*b*) "The king should, in the matter of taxes, act like the leech drawing blood mildly. He should conduct himself towards his subjects like a tigress in the matter of carrying her cubs, touching them with her teeth, but never piercing them therewith. He should behave like a mouse which, though possessed of sharp and pointed teeth, still bites the feet of sleeping animals in such a manner that they do not at all become conscious of it."[25]

[24] *Manu*, vii, 129.

[25] *Śānti*, lxxxviii, 5.

advent of Mahāvīra. These were later on either lost or incorporated in the later literature. Prof. Jacobi opines and probably quite rightly, that this existence of an earlier literature (*pūrva*) presupposes the existence of an earlier sect of the Nigaṇṭhas.[14]

(vii) Above all Prof. Jacobi points out that the *Majjhima Nikāya* records a disputation between Buddha and Saccaka whose father belonged to Nigaṇṭha order. " Saccaka is not a Nigaṇṭha himself, as he boasts of having vanquished Nātaputta in disputation, and moreover the tenets he defends are not those of the Jainas. Now when a famous controversialist, whose father was a Nigaṇṭha was a contemporary of the Buddha, the Nigaṇṭhas can scarcely have been a sect founded during Buddha's life." [15]

These evidences, it appears, presuppose the existence of a Nigaṇṭha order founded by Pārśvanātha before the advent of Mahāvīra. It is also admitted on all hands that Mahāvīra joined that order for sometime at the beginning of his ascetic career and that he left it on account of some possible degeneration that had crept into that community.[16]

(5) Pārśvanātha's contribution.

Pārśvanātha flourished, as already noted, towards the end of the ninth century (817) B. C. [17] which was the age of Brahmanical predominance. Pārśvanātha's position, therefore, becomes more distinct and the value of his services becomes more prominent when one takes into consideration the possible difficulties he might have undergone in raising an uncompromising protest against Brahmanical tyranny.

It appears that Pārśvanātha, " the people's favourite" founded a new religion which was not meant for the selected

[14] Jacobi, Introduction to the *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. II, *SBE.*, vol. xlv, p. xxiii.
[16] Stevenson, *The Heart of Jainism*, p. 35.
[17] Ibid, p. 48.

few but for all. The age of Pārśvanātha was coeval with the age of the older Upaniṣads when the thoughtful section of the community in their zeal for the attainment of the knowledge of the supreme world left the suffering masses to shift for themselves. At this juncture Pārśvanātha recognised the moral elevation of the people at large and especially of the lower castes as a supreme task of religion. He felt for them and came forward to their help. Hence the significance of the standing addition "the people's favourite"[18] to his name. It implies that Pārśvanātha's mission was to uplift the mass. It appears, besides, that his movements, as such, were not favourably looked upon by the aggressive Brahmanism of the period and the attitude of it was probably positively hostile. This is confirmed by the utter silence of the Brahmanical literature about Pārśva and the fact that though he was a prince of the Madhyadeśa he could not do anything great in that part of the country where Śuddha and Mahāvīra moved so triumphantly later on. His progress in that quarter was not anything remarkable and his order probably could not be anything better than a shifting body of monks and nuns, as it really was when Keśi was at the head.[19]

Another characteristic feature of Pārśvanātha's order appears to have been the elevation of the status of women. However eloquent we may be about the names of Gārgī Vāchaṇavī and Maitreyī, it cannot but be admitted that the status of women-folk was far from being very high in the time of Pārśvanātha. Only a few women might have raised themselves into recognition by dint of their own learning and independence of spirit. Pārśvanātha seems to have

[18] Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. I., *SBE.*, vol. xxii.

[19] It may be noted that many of the religious orders of the time consisted of a body of monks who loved to shift from place to place lecturing on special religious topics for winning over the people to their sides. Such were the orders of *Makkhali Gośāla*, Sañjaya Belaṭṭhiputta, Pakudha Kaccayāna and many others recorded in the Buddhist literature.

tried his best to give to this weaker sex full freedom and to maintain equality between man and woman in matters religious. This is why we see that he admitted a large number of female disciples into his order without any consideration of the possibility of a future degeneration; and he, and only he, appears to be the first of such well-wishers.

The most important feature of his movement was the emphasis he placed upon the doctrine of *ahiṁsā*. It was another point in which he made a bold departure from the prevalent custom of the Brāhmaṇas; whatever spiritual significance might have been attached to the Vedic sacrifices, the people could scarcely act in accordance with it. The merciless slaughter of animals in sacrifices possibly had drawn the attention of Pārśvanātha. His independent spirit could not brook this kind of slaughter of life in the name of religion and thus he enjoined the vow of non-killing as one of the fundamental principles of his religion. Along with this doctrine of *ahiṁsā* he introduced three other great vows:[20] of abstinence from telling lie (*satya*), from stealing (*asteya*) and from having any property (*aparigraha*). These four great vows (*caujjāma saṁvara*)[21] of Pārśvanātha constituted one of the important features of the immediate background of Jainism proper.

The metaphysical tenets of Pārśvanātha, as can be gathered from incidental references, were in their elementary forms. He maintained that knowledge, faith and right conduct are the true means to final liberation. The four passions (anger, pride, deceit and greed) together with the five senses are the dreadful drawbacks which should be checked as soon as possible. One can put an end to the cycle of births to which he is subject by doing this. "There is a safe place in view of all, but difficult of approach, where there is neither old age nor death, nor pain nor disease. This is what is called

[20] Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. II, *SBE.*, xlv, p. 121. [21] Ibid, p. 121, n. 2.

nirvāṇa or freedom from pain. It is the safe, happy and quiet place which the great sages reach.'[22]

For the attainment of this goal, we understand, Pārśvanātha enjoined such religious practices as the observance of four great vows and the three *guptis*, etc. Religious suicide also appears to have been considered by Pārśvanātha as a method for the attainment of salvation. The *Ācārāṅga sūtra*[23] records two different processes of religious suicide. The one which is older is to be accredited to Pārśvanātha.

(6) PĀRŚVANĀTHA'S ORDER.

The Nigaṇṭha community, left by Pārśvanātha, was, traditionally speaking,[24] an excellent community of 16,000 *śramaṇas* and 30,000 nuns with 164,000 lay disciples. One however, cannot place implicit reliance on these traditional numbers. One cannot believe at once that in the period of Brahmanical predominance Pārśvanātha could have been in a position to create such a large community. What appears to be probable is that he succeeded in leaving behind a Nigaṇṭha order consisting of a fairly large number of monks and nuns besides a laity which was large enough to support this order.

This order seems to have undergone some changes in the period intervening between the death of Pārśvanātha and the advent of Mahāvīra. Some degeneration probably crept into the church and this might have been the cause of Mahāvīra's alienation.[25] The possibility of this degeneration also suggests

[22] Ibid, p. 128.

[23] Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. 1, *SBE.*, vol. xxii, p. 120. That religious suicide was enjoined by Pārśva becomes evident from that not only Pārśvanātha himself but also Mahāvīra's parents who belonged to Pārśva's order committed it. *Cf. Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. I, p. 420.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Professor Jacobi also suggests that there might have been some decay of morals in the order of Pārśvanātha; *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. II, *SBE.*, vol. xlv, p. 122, n. 3. But the ground

itself when one considers the fact that Pārśvanātha did not introduce any hard and fast commandment regarding the vow of chastity and that he allowed a free admittance of women into the community, perhaps, for the first time in India.

However, at this juncture this order of Pārśvānatha became amalgamated with the newly founded order of Mahāvīra through the intercession of Keśi and Gautama. Inspite of this a spirit of dissension continued to work for some time and this took a definite shape in the division of the church into two factions—the Digambara and Śvetāmbara.

The tradition records that Pārśva left eight *gaṇas* with theirs *gaṇadharas* behind him.[26] It may be presumed on the strength of this statement that there was possibly some good arrangement for the government and organisation of the community from the earliest times. This state of things continued up to the time of Mahāvīra, as one finds that followers of the order travelled under leaders like Keśi from place to place. They were not scattered here and there but constituted an organised body.

(7) Makkhali Gośāla and the original Nigaṇṭha Order.

The intimate relation of Makkhali Gośāla with the Jainas and the existence of certain common elements both in Ajivikism and Jainism tend to suggest that he was probably

he adduces appears to be doubtful. A passage of the *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra* runs thus: "Gautama replied to Keśi—'The first saints were simple but slow of understanding, the last saints prevaricating and slow of understanding, those between the two simple and wise, hence there are two forms of the law." Jacobi also remarks in this connection: 'the argumentation in the text presupposes a decay of morals of the monastic order to have occurred between Pārśva and Mahavīra.' But the passage in question does not seem to refer to any such decay of morals definitely. It rather appears to refer to the fact that the religion at first was in its pristine simplicity but with Mahāvīra who introduced a complex metaphysical system that simplicity ceased. The first saints were slow of understanding and thus unable to introduce that philosophical system but Mahāvīra was not of that type.

26 Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. I, *SBE.*, vol. xxii.

connected with the original Nigaṇṭha order in some way or other.

We know from the account of Pārśvanātha's life that he himself practised severe austerities for a long time. There can be no doubt, therefore, that he was an ardent advocate of it and as such he introduced it into his religious system. Curiously enough, Makkhali Gośāla also emphasises again and again on this severe asceticism.

It has been already seen that the vow of chastity was significant by its absence from the disciplinary rules of Pārśvanātha's order. Makkhali Gośāla also is accused of unchastity, more than once though in an exaggerated way.

Another significant fact is that the six *leśyā*[27] divisions of the Nigaṇṭhas are just similar to the Ājivika division of mankind into six classes (*chalābhijātis*).[28] Both are based on the same psychological principles and both of them seem to presuppose the older Nigaṇṭha division into six *jīvanikāyas*.[29]

The disciples of Makkhali Gośāla, again, firmly believed him to be their last Tīrthaṁkara.[30] It appears that this Ājivika tendency to attribute the qualities of a Tīrthaṁkara (a word which especially belongs to the Jaina terminology) to Gośāla was due to the influence of the beliefs of the original Nigaṇṭha order. This is why they persisted in maintaining that their leader was the last Tīrthaṁkara whereas the followers of Mahāvīra maintained that Mahāvīra was the last Tīrthaṁkara.

[27] *leśyā*, the totality of Karma done by a man gives a transcendental colour, a kind of complexion to the soul. It cannot be perceived by our eyes. These colours are six in number, viz., *kṛṣṇa-leśyā*, *nīla-leśyā*, *kāpota-leśyā*, *tejo-leśyā*, *padma-leśyā*, *śukla-leśyā*. The first three belong to decidedly bad characters and the last three to good ones. Cf. Stevenson, *Heart of Jainism*, pp. 102-104.

[28] *Chalābhajātis*: mankind can be divided into six classes—black, blue, red, yellow, white and supremely white. The Jainas belong to the red class whereas the followers of Makkhali belonged to the white and those of Nanda Vacca and Kiśa Saṇkiccha to the supremely white class. Cf. Dr. B. M. Barua, *The Ājivikas* (Calcutta University).

[29] *Ācārāṅga Sūtra*, *P. T. S.*, II, p. 15; Dr. B. M. Barua, *The Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*, p. 303.

[30] Dr. B. M. Barua, *The Ājivikas*.

Thus it seems probable that Gośāla began his religious career in the order of Pārśavanātha and even worked with Mahāvīra as such. He later on left that community and joined the small Ājivika order of Nanda Vaccha and Kiśa Saṁkiccha and raised that order to a status of recognition ere long. He probably could not be free from some of the Nīgaṇṭha predilections which became deep-rooted in the Ājivikism which took a new shape at the hands of Makkhali Gośāla.

(8) Mahāvīra and the Original Nigaṇṭha Order.

Most of the features of Pārśvanātha's religion are conspicuously present in the later Jainism. They underwent only some minor changes at the hands of Mahāvīra. Thus Mahāvīra added the vow of chastity to the four great vows introduced by Pārśvanātha. "The law as taught by the great sage Pārśva," records the *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtr* ,[31] "recognised but four great vows (*caujjāma saṁvara*)." It however cannot be believed that a great religious teacher like Pārśvanātha did ignore this important injunction. What seems to be possible is that he implicitly included it in one of the four vows, naturally that of abstinence from having any property (*aparigraha*).[32] Mahāvīra simply emphasized this point. Another innovation which Mahāvīra introduced was his rule permitting the disciples to go about naked.

These minor changes cannot merely be applied as a test of Mahāvīra's attainments. His contribution to Jainism lay chiefly in the development of the metaphysical side of the Nigaṇṭha religion. The moral precepts of Pārśvanātha demanded a deeper metaphysical justification which was supplied by Mahāvīra's doctrines.

Inspite of this development of the metaphysical side which is useful only to the advanced few, it appears that the

[31] Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras*, Pt. II, *SBE.*, vol. xlv, p. 121. [32] Ibid, p. 121, n. 2.

Jainism, as preached by Mahavīra, was substantially the same as Pārśvanātha's religion. The fundamental principles of the two religions were not at all different, though the minute details might not have agreed. "*Both laws pursuing the same end,*"[33] asks Keśi to Gautama, "what has caused this difference? Have you no misgivings about this twofold law, O wise man?"[34] And from what Gautama says in reply, it becomes quite plausible that both the creeds were essentially the same, the difference consisted only in the various outward marks of the religious men.

Mahāvīra, therefore, does not appear to have made any capture from the lines laid down by his predcessor or to have done anything beyond some improvements necessitated by the requirements of the time. The deveoe ment of the metaphysical side also was a necessity whic possibly throse from the strong opposition of the existing systems.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

(1) We have seen that the traditional list of the Jaina Tīrthaṁkaras cannot be relied upon implicitly. The first twenty-two of them appear to be shadowy and fictitious personages and no historical importance can be attributed to them at the present state of our knowledge.

(2) From a few genuine references to the 23rd Tīrthaṁkara—Pārśvanātha—we have tried to suggest that the history of Jainism really begins with him. The principal features of his movement, as we understand from those incidental references, were—

(*a*) The uplifting of the mass and the consequent abolition of the caste system and class distinctions.

(*b*) The elevation of the status of women.

(*c*) The introduction of the four great vows (the

[33] Ibid, p. 122. [34] Ibid. p, 123.

caujjāma saṁvara)—non-killing, and abstinence from telling any lie, from stealing and from possessing any property—*ahiṁsā, satyam, asteya,* and *aparigraha.*

(*d*) In addition to these four great vows he enjoined strict asceticism as the only way for the attainment of salvation. The practice of religious suicide also may be resorted to as a method for facilitating the attainment of the desired end.

(3) We have also tried to make it clear that the doctrines of Pārśvanātha constituted the immediate background of the later Jainism. Mahāvīra only followed in the footsteps of his eminent predecessor and raised a grand superstructure on the foundations laid down by Pārśvanātha.

(4) Above all, it has become evident that Jainism was not a new phenomenon in the history of Indian religion of the sixth century B.C., as is popularly supposed. The Jaina traditional accounts are quite justified in carrying back the origin of their religion to the previous Tīrthaṁkaras, at least as far as Pārśvanātha, the twenty-third of them, is concerned.

There seems to be no denying the fact that this twenty-third Tīrthaṁkara was a historical personage and was no doubt one of the most powerful religious teachers who fought against the aggressive Brahmanism of the period as early as the ninth century B.C. He persisted in carrying out his mission with every possible care and unflinching courage. He came as a liberator of the depressed and down-trodden and passed away with laurels on his crown leaving his work to be continued by his successors to perfection.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF EARLY BUDDHIST SCHOOLS

BY

RYUKAN KIMURA,

Lecturer in Indian Buddhist History and Mahāyāna Philosophy, University of Calcutta.

I

Introduction.

(*i*) *Prefatory.*—The account of the early Buddhist Schools, known to the Southern[1] Buddhists as eighteen in number and to the Northern[2] Buddhists as twenty in number, is an important problem in the history of Indian Buddhism. This is because the Buddhist Schools[3] to which even the non-Buddhist literature subsequent to Nāgārjuna gives great importance, had their origin in these early schools, and also because they have been dealt with more or less by the Buddhist writers of almost all the countries. The importance of the history of the Schools again is due to another fact. From the death of the Buddha up to the accession of Aśoka (B. C. 486-268)[4] only three isolated incidents are known in the history of the Buddhist church, viz., the First Buddhist Council at Rājagṛha

[1] Cf. *Mahāvaṁsa, Dīpavaṁsa, Kathāvattu, Sāmantapāsādikā*, etc.

[2] Cf. *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* of Vasumitra.

[3] These schools are generally known as four in number, viz., Sarvâstivāda, Yogâcāra, Sautrântika and Mādhyamika. But it should be noted here, that there was another school, the Bhūta-tathatā school founded by Aśvaghoṣa II. about 5th century A.D., which has escaped the notice of the scholars. This school is known only to Chinese and Japanese Buddhists.

[4] S. Mochizuki, *Buddhist Chronology* (in Japanese).

(circa B. C. 486), the Second Council some 100 years later at Vaiśālī (circa B.C. 383-2)[5] and the Third Council at Pāṭaliputra (circa B. C. 247). We know nothing about the vicissitudes through which Buddhism passed during the two intervals. The history of the early schools, I think, is the only connecting link of these three isolated incidents.

It is commonly known, that the first separation in the Buddhist church, i.e., the Mahāsaṅghika separation, took place at the Second Council. The interval between the Second Council and the time of Aśoka saw the division of the Mahāsaṅghikas into nine, and of the Sthaviravādins into eleven different schools. The origin of these schools, again, cannot but be the logical result of some previous movements. We can, therefore, seek for these antecedents in the preceding interval between the First Council and the Second Council.

(*ii*) *The sources of our information.*—Let us examine what kinds of information we get concerning the subject.

A. *Chinese.*

(1) The account of Vasumitra. Vasumitra[6] was a contemporary of Kaṇiṣka II., the Great (circa A. D. 140). He wrote a book on the eighteen schools, the original of which is

[5] Geiger, *Mahāvaṁśa*, p. lix.

[6] According to Chinese records we have two Vasumitras. The first Vasumitra flourished in the 3rd century A. D. as he was contemporary of Dharmatrāta, who according to the *Avadānasūtra*, was the uncle of the former and flourished in the 3rd century after Buddha. This Vasumitra is the author of one of the six *Pāda-śāstras* of the Sarvāstivādins, viz., the *Abhidharma-prakaraṇa-pāda-śāstra*. See Mochizuki, *Chronology*, p. 86; Beal, *Texts from the Buddhist Canon* (*Dhammapada*), p. 8; Rockhill, *Udānavarga*, p. xi.

The second Vasumitra wrote upon the eighteen schools. In his treatise he says: "At the beginning of the 4th century one school named the Sautrāntika, otherwise called the Saṁkrāntivāda issued again from the Sarvāstivāda." Cf. Mr. J. Masuda's translation in the *Jour. Dept. Letters* (*Cal. Uni.*), I, p. 7. S. Mochizuki also mentions the date of the separation as A. B. 445, i.e., B.C. 41. Thus he must have flourished later; and it is probable that he was contemporary of Kaṇiṣka II., the Great. This Vasumitra wrote another book, *Ārya-Bodhisattva-Vasumitra-saṅgīti-śāstra*, translated by Saṅghabhūti (circa A D. 384). From this book we come to know that he belonged to the Sarvāstivāda School.

lost, but it exists in Chinese and Tibetan translations. There are three different Chinese translations of the book—

i. Shi-pa-pu-lun, Dr. Nanjio restores it as *Aṣṭādaśa-nikāya-śāstra*, commonly known as *Chin-lun*, meaning the *Śāstra* translated under the Chin dynasty. The translator is unknown.[7]

ii. Pu-cih-i-lun or *Nikāya-avalambana-śāstra* (writer's restoration), commonly known as *Ch'en-lun* as translated under the Chen dynasty (A.D. 557-588) by Paramārtha. (Nanjio's catalogue No. 1285.)

iii. I-pu-tsun-lun-lun or *Nikāya-bheda-dharmamati-cakra-śāstra* (writer's restoration) commonly known as *Thān-lun* as translated under the Thān dynasty (A.D. 618-906) by Hiuen-Tsiang about A. D. 662.

(2) *Wan-shu-shi-li-wan-chin* or *Mañjuśrī-paripṛcchā-sūtra* (Nanjio's restoration) translated by Saṅghapāla of the Lian dynasty in 518 A.D. This *sūtra* belongs to the Mahāyāna Vinaya in the Chinese Tripiṭaka. It consists of 17 chapters, the 15th speaks of some schools only.

(3) *Sho-li-fu-chin* or *Sāriputra-paripṛcchā-sūtra* (Nanjio's restoration), translated under the Eastern Tsin dynasty (A.D. 317-420) but the translator is unknown. It is included in the Hīnayāna Vinaya of the Chinese Tripiṭaka. One chapter only deals with the names of the Buddhist schools and with the causes of separation. (Nanjio's Catalogue No. 452.)

(4) Besides the above sources, Hiuen-Tsiang and I-tsing make several important notices about some of these schools.

[7] Some catalogues mention Paramārtha (557-69 of Chin dynasty), but others simply say that the translation was done under the Chin dynasty. No translator is mentioned there. Depending on this, there are scholars who think that the translator was Kumārajīva, because he lived at that period. But this assumption is without foundation. Paramārtha also could not have translated it, as another translation of the same book has been ascribed to him. Cf. *Kai-yuen-lun*, Vol. III (A.D. 730). Dr. Nanjio says that the translator is Paramārtha (No. 1284).

B. *Tibetan.*

In the Tibetan *Dulva*, the Vinaya of the Sarvâstivādin school, we have three accounts regarding the Buddhist schools.

(1) *Samaya-bhedoparacana-cakra* : this is the Tibetan version of Vasumitra's work, the Chinese translations of which have been mentioned above. It has been translated by the late Russian scholar Wassilief in 1800.

(2) *Nikāya-bheda-vibhanga-vyakhyāna* (not *Kāyobhatra-vibhaṅga*)[8] by Bhāvya, an Indian Buddhist of great renown.[9] Rockhill gives almost a literal translation of Bhāvya's work in the sixth chapter of his *Life of Buddha.*

(3) *Nikāya-bhedopadeśana-nāma-saṅgraha.*[10]

(4) *Bhikṣu-varṣāgra-pṛcchā*, the author of which is not known.

(5) The accounts of Tārānātha.[11]

C. *Pali.*

(1) *Kathāvatthu*,—the canonical book of controversy, with its commentary by Buddhaghoṣa written by Moggaliputta Tissa on the occasion of the Council of Pāṭaliputra.[12] It has been translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, assisted by Mr. S. Z. Aung, in the *J. P. T. S.* 1915.

(2) *Mahābodhivaṁśa* (*J. P. T. S.*, 1890).

(3) *Sāsanavaṁśa*, M. Bode (*J. P. T. S.*, 1897).

(4) Ceylonese *Nikāya-saṁgraha* (Ed. Wickermasingha), pp. 6-9.

(5) *Dīpavaṁśa.*

[8] Rockhill's *Life of Buddha*, p. 181; also M. Poussin's article on "Five Points of Mahādeva", *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 413.

[9] Rockhill, op. cit., p. viii.

[10] Rockhill, op. cit., p. 181; M. Poussin, loc. cit.

[11] Rockhill, loc. cit.

[12] Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*.

(6) *Mahāvaṁśa.*

(7) *Milindapañha* deals with many important doctrines of the eighteen schools, as pointed out by Professor Rhys Davids, in his Introduction of Milinda (*S. B. E.*, XXXV, ii, p. xxi). Certain identifications are also made by him.[13]

II

The Causes of Separation.

(*i*) *Immediate Causes.*—In the history of Buddhism it is a well-known fact, that a schism in the church began for the first time, with the separation of the Mahāsaṅghikas from the Mūla-Sthaviravādins. There are two versions—Northern and Southern—about the date of the separation. The southern version [14] speaks that some four months after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, a great assembly, commonly known as the First Council, was held at Rājagṛha. One hundred years thence, in the 11th year of the reign of Kālāśoka, the so-called Second Council was held at Vaiśālī.[15] The reason stated for the holding of this council was the consideration of the legality of the Ten points endorsed by the Vajjian monks. Seven hundred monks took part in that assembly. In opposition to the unfavourable decision of this assembly the heretical Vajjian monks convoked another

[13] *J. R. A. S.*, 1892, pp. 1-57. Other important articles are—
"Buddhist Councils" by M. Poussin, *E. R. E.*, Vol. IV, p. 179.
"Five Points of Mahādeva" by M. Poussin, *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, pp. 413 ff.
"Buddhist Councils at Rajagṛha and Vaiśālī" by Dr. R. O. Franke, *J. P. T. S.*, 1908.
"Sects of the Buddhists," by Dr. Rhys Davids, *J. R. A. S.*, 1891, pp. 411 ff. and 1892, pp. 3 ff.
"Eighteen Schools of Buddhism" by Beal, *Ind. Ant.*, ix, p. 291.
Also Dr. Takakusu in *J. P. T. S.*, 1904-05, pp. 6 ff.

[14] Geiger, *Mahāvaṁśa*, Intro., p. liv; *Sāmantapāsādikā*, Intro.; *Cullavagga* XII (*S. B. E.*, Vol. XX, p. 386), *Dīpavaṁśa*, pp. 27-47; Oldenberg, Vol. III, p. 293.

[15] In circa B. C. 383-2, at this time Sonaka was the master of the Vinaya.

council in which a vast number of monks took part. This is called the Mahāsaṅghika council.[16]

Isolated references only to these councils are available in the Northern Records. Hiuen Tsiang's account[17] speaks that the Mahāsaṅghika separation took place in the first council which was called by the orthodox section of the church for compiling the *Tripiṭakas.* The heretical monks in defiance, held another council, the Mahāsaṅghika one, and compiled the Five *Piṭakas* :—*Sūtra*, *Vinaya*, *Abhidharma*, *Saṁyukta*, and *Mantra*. The account of Paramārtha the commentator on Vasumitra's treatise is the same as that of Hiuen Tsiang.[18]

We have another account from the northern sources in the treatise of Vasumitra. "Thus I have heard," says Vasumitra in his *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun*, "A hundred and odd years

[16] *Dīpavaṁsa*, V., 30-31; Oldenberg, p. 148; Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, p. 26.

[17] "To the south-west of the bamboo garden (*Veṇuvana*) about 5 or 6 li on the north side of the southern mountain, is a great bamboo forest. In the middle of it is a long stone house. Here the venerable Kāśyapa with 999 great Arhats, after Tathāgata's *nirvāṇa* called a convocation (for the purpose of settling) the Three *Piṭakas* . . . . . At this time fifteen days of the summer rest (*varṣāvasāna*) had elapsed. On this Kāśyapa rising, said, "Consider well and listen! Let Ānanda, who ever heard the words of Tathāgata, collect by singing through the *Sūtra-Piṭaka*. Let Upāli, who clearly understands the rules of discipline (*Vinaya*), and is well known to all who know, collect the *Vinaya-Piṭaka*, and I, Kāśyapa, will collect the *Abhidharma-Piṭaka*, the three months of rain being past, the collection of the *Tripiṭaka* was finished. As the great Kāśyapa was the president among the priests, it is called the Sthavira convocation . . . . . going west from the point 20 *li* or so, is a *stūpa* built by Aśoka Rāja. This is the spot where the 'great assembly' (*Mahāsaṅghika*) formed their collection of books (or, held their assembly). Those who had not been permitted to join Kāśyapa's assembly, whether learners or those above learning (Arhats), to the number of 100,000 men came together to this spot and said 'whilst Tathāgata was alive we all had a common master, but now that the King of the Law is dead it is different. We wish to show our gratitude to the Buddha, and we also will hold an assembly for collecting the scriptures. On this the common folk with the holy disciples came to the assembly (all assembled), the foolish and wise alike flocked together and collected the *Sūtra-Piṭaka*, the *Vinaya-Piṭaka*, the *Abhidharma-Piṭaka* the *Miscellaneous Piṭaka* (the *Khuddakanikāya*) and the *Dhārṇī-Piṭaka*. Thus they distinguished five *Piṭakas* and because in this assembly both common folk and holy personages were mixed together, it was called 'the assembly of the great congregation' (*Mahāsaṅghika*).—See Beal, *Records*, II, pp. 161-165.)

[18] It should be noted here that Paramārtha's account exists only in quotations, the original being lost. Cf. Dr. E. Mayeda, *History of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (in Japanese), p. 8. Paramārtha commented on the *Pu-chi-i-lun*.

after the *parinirvaṇa* of Buddha Bhagavān (alas! that ominous time!) being far from the time of the Sage, (the age so dark), as if the sun had been setting for a long time, there was a king named Aśoka at Kusumapura in the Magadha Kingdom, who ruled over Jambudvīpa, as it were, under a (large) white umbrella, and his influence extended to the gods and men. It was at this time that the great *Saṅgha* split up for the first time. On account of the differences (of opinion) among the four groups of people in discussing the Five Points (*pañcā-vastūni*), propounded by Mahādeva, (the Buddhist Saṁgha) was divided into two schools, viz., Mahāsaṅghika and Sthaviravāda ".[19]

It becomes clear from the above accounts that whereas Hiuen Tsiang and Paramārtha agree in placing the separation in the First Council, Vasumitra has no pretension to any definiteness in his statement. He simply mentions that the separation took place " 100 years after the *parinirvāṇa* " during the reign of Aśoka. He does not tell us at all whether this Aśoka is Dharmâśoka or not and whether the separation took place in the Second Council or not. Vasumitra's account,[20] as such, accords with the statement of the southern records, *Dīpavaṁśa*, *Mahāvaṁśa* etc. The Aśoka in question, therefore,

[19] Cf. Mr. J. Masuda's translation of a portion of the *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* in the *Jour. Dept. Letters* (*Cal. Uni.*), Vol. I.

[20] Be it noted that the cause assigned by Vasumitra for the separation does not correspond to the cause assigned by the southern records—Dīpavaṁśa etc. According to Vasumitra it is the " Five points of Mahādeva ". These as recorded in *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* are:

(1) (The Arhats are) tempted by others (i. e. *Māras*);
(2) (The Arhats have) ignorance (about their attainment of Arhatship)
(3) (The Arhats have) doubt (regarding truths)
(4) (The Arhats) enter (into Arhatship) by (the help of) others
(5) (The realisation of) the path is ascertained by utterance.

Cf. the translation by Mr. J. Masuda.

They are, as recorded in the *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra*:—

(1) An Arhat may commit a sin under unconscious temptation.
(2) One may be an Arhat and not know it.
(3) An Arhat may have doubts in matters of doctrine.
(4) One cannot attain Arhatship without the help of a teacher.

appears to be Kālāśoka.[21] That the separation could not take place in the First Council is corroborated by the evidence of the *Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya* (Vol. 32)[22] which, as the name implies, belonged to the Mahāsaṅghikas. It is a significant fact that this *Vinaya* when giving an account of the First Council makes no reference to the separation, the mention of which can be reasonably expected, had it taken place in the First Council. Hiuen Tsiang, therefore, seems to be wrong in placing the schism in the First Council. It appears that through the carelessness of the later writers the whole matter was confused and the accounts of the First and Second Councils became awkwardly amalgamated.[23] The separation of the Mahāsaṅghikas, therefore, certainly took place in the Second Council at Vaiśālī, and not in the First Council at Rājagṛha.

As to the causes of this seperation, it has been already noted that the cause attributed by the Southern Records is the Ten Points [24] of the Vajjian monks, and by the Northern Records the Five Points of Mahādeva. Both the Southern

(5) The noble way may begin with a shout, that is, one meditating seriously on religion may make such exclamation as "How sad!" and by so doing attain progress towards perfection.

Cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 416 (translation by Watters).

The cause assigned by the Southern Records, *Mahāvaṁśa*, *Dīpavaṁśa* etc. less in the Ten Points of the Vajjian monks. It appears to me that the Five disputed points arose in the time of Vaiśālī Council and constituted one of the causes of the separation. Mahādēva, who was sent as missionary to Deccan in the time of Dharmāśoka discussed it in the Third Council in a new method and thus his name came to be attached to the previously existing five points. I shall come back to this point later on in detail.

[21] According to the Japanese Buddhist historians and some European scholars like Dr. Kern, Kālāśoka is identified with Dharmāśoka. It is argued that the former name was applied to him in his vicious days and the latter in his rightoous days. This is inconsistent with the accounts of *Dīpavaṁśa* and *Mahāvaṁśa*. Cf. Prof. Bhandarkar's *Carmichael Lectures*, p. 82; Geiger, *Mahāvaṁśa*, Introduction, p. lix.

[22] Translated into Chinese by Buddhabhadra with Fa Hien, A.D. 416 of Eastern Fan dynasty (A.D. 317-420), Vol. 32, *Lie* Bundle, No. X of Chinese *Tripiṭaka*.

[23] Cf. also *Indian Buddhism* by Dr. U. Ogiyaru (in Japanese), p. 39; Dr. Anesaki's *Religious History of India*, p. 517 (in Japanese); *History of the Buddhist Council*, by Dr. B. Matsumoto p. 32 (in Japanese).

[24] The Ten Points are:

i. That salt might be preserved in horn; salt like other edibles might not, according to the *Vinaya*, be laid aside for use.

and Northern Records agree as far as the Ten Points are concerned. We are, therefore, sure that the Ten Points constituted one of the causes of the separation.

The Southern Records do not agree in accepting the Five Points of Mahādeva as one of the causes. Hiuen Tsiang, however, accepts this and places the separation in the First Council of Rājagṛha. Elsewhere in connection with the description of the Kashmir country he says that hundred years after Buddha in the time of Aśoka the Sthaviravādins could not harmonize with the Mahāsaṅghikas on the five disputed points of Mahādeva and left Magadha for Kashmir. He says: "In the hundredth year after the *nirvāṇa* of Tathāgata, Aśoka, king of Magadha, extended his power over the world and was honoured even by distant people. He deeply reverenced the Three Gems and had a loving regard for all living thing. At this time there were 500 Arhats and 500 schismatical priests, whom the king honoured and patronised without any difference. Among the latter was a priest called Mahādeva, a man of deep learning and rare ability; in his retirement he sought a true renown; for thinking, he wrote treatises, the principles of which were opposed wholly to the doctrine, all who heard of him resorted to his company and adopted his views.

ii. That solid food might be taken not only till noon, but till the sun threw shadows two inches long.

iii. That the rules of the *Vinaya* might be relaxed in the country, away from the conveniences of the monasteries.

iv. That ordination, confession etc. might be performed in private houses and not only in the Upasatha halls attached to the monasteries.

v. That where the consent of the order was necessary to any act, that consent might be obtained after and not long before the act.

vi. That conformity to the example of others was a good excuse for relaxing rules.

vii. That food might be taken after noon, and not only liquids such as water or milk.

viii. That fermented drinks, if they looked like water, might be drunk.

ix. That seats covered with cloths may be allowed, so long as the cloths had no fringes.

x. That gold and silver might be received by members of the order.

Aśoka Rāja, not knowing either holy or common men and because he was naturally given to patronise those who were seditious, was induced to call together an assembly of priests to the bank of the Ganges, intending to drown them all. At this time the Arhats having seen the danger threatening their lives, by the exercise of their spiritual power flew away through the air and came to this country (Kashmir)."[25]

The Chinese pilgrim here, though he mentions the time as one hundred years after the *Nirvāṇa*, i.e., the time of the Second Council, refers to an event which took place in the Third Council. The event he refers to is that the Sthaviravādins could not harmonize with the Mahāsaṅghikas on Five Points and left Magadha for Kashmir. This took place in the time of Dharma-Aśoka, in the Third Council.[26] It is therefore, apparent that the Chinese pilgrims made a confusion between the two Aśokas, and the two Buddhist Councils which took place under them. He has also mixed up the Five Points which were those of the Mahāsaṅghika separation with the Five Points of Mahādeva, which resulted in the departure of the Sthaviravādins to Kashmir. That the Five Points were the cause of both the events is also corroborated by the evidence of *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra* [27] which mentions that the Five Points of Mahādeva were the cause of both the Mahāsaṅghika separation and the Sthaviravādin's departure.

On the whole, we learn from *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun*, Hiuen Tsiang's record and *Abhidharma-śāstra* that Mahādeva's "Five Points" were the cause which led to the separation of the Sthaviravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas and the departure of the

[25] S. Beal's, *Buddhist Records of the Western Land*, Vol. I, pp. 150-157.

[26] It is also to be noted that Hiuen Tsiang's statement is not about the Second Council as it is similar to the description of the Third Council of the Southern Records, cf. *Dipavaṁśa* 30-43, p. 157.

[27] Vol. 99. Compiled by 500 monks with Vasumitra at their head, 400 years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, translated by Hiuen Tsiang, A. D. 656-59 under the Thān dynasty 618-907 A. D. *Sho*, 4 Bundle No. 4, pp. 96-97 of Chinese *Tripiṭaka*.

Sthaviravādins from Magadha. The first event occurred 100 years after Buddha's death and the second 300 years after *Parinirvāṇa* (i.e., in the time of Aśoka) as will appear from the Southern records and the political history of India.

Now let us examine whether these points were really the cause of the 2nd Council.

Do the Southern Records mention Mahādeva? The Ceylonese chronicle, *Dīpavaṁśa*,[28] tells us in connection with the 3rd Council that Moggaliputta Tissa being asked by Dharma-Aśoka sent missionaries to different countries. Among them there was one named Mahādeva who was sent to Mahisāmaṇḍala (i.e., Andhra country).[29] As to the five points we find mention of them in the *Kathāvatthu* (II. 5 and 6). These are the same as what we know from Tibetan and Chinese sources.[30] But these five points of *Kathāvatthu* have no direct connection with Mahādeva. We only know indirectly something about such connection from Buddhaghoṣ's commentary.[31] Buddhaghoṣa tells us that these five points of *Kathāvatthu* were held by the Andhra Schools—(Pūrva-śaila and Apara-śaila). It is, however, a well-known fact that Mahādeva who came from Magadha as a missionary, was the founder of these schools.[32] Thus some connection between these five points and Mahādeva becomes apparent. This is also corroborated by the account of *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun*:

"Towards the close of the 2nd century, there was a heretic priest who returned to the right doctrine (i.e., Buddhism) discarding his heretical views. He too, was called Mahādeva, became a monk, and received his full ordination (*upasampadā*) in the Mahāsaṅghika order. He was learned and diligent. He dwelt on the Caitya hill and discussed again with the priest of this school, in detail, the five points whereon, on

[28] VII 58, VIII 12.
[29] Cf. My article in *Jour. Dept. Letters* (*Cal. Uni.*), Vol. I.
[30] Poussin in *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, pp. 413-23.
[31] Translation by Mrs Rhys Davids and A. Z. Aung, pp. 111-24.
[32] Cf. My article in *Jour. Dept. Letters* (*Cal. Uni.*), Vol. I, p. 21.

account of discussion the Saṅgha) became split up into three Schools: (1) Chaitya-śaila, (2) Apara-śaila, and (3) Uttara-śaila."[33]

Thus the fact becomes established that there was a leader named Mahādeva, in the time of Aśoka, who went to the Āndhra country and discussed the five points. These five points of Mahādeva, I think, became the cause of the departure of the Sthaviras to Kāshmir.

It is however, a significant thing, that these "Five Points" of Mahādeva are nowhere related with the cause of the Mahā-saṅghika separation in the Southern Records. It may be assumed that the Five Points might have been in existence before this time (i.e., the time of Dharma-Aśoka) but it is very doubtful whether they were connected with Mahādeva in any way.

I-pu-tsun-lun-lun only connects these Five Points, which constituted the cause of the Mahāsaṅghika separation, with Mahādeva. But the other Chinese translations of Vasumitra's treatise are quite silent on this point; whereas they all, being the translations of the same work, should have been agreed on this important point. Thus Paramārtha's translation of the treatise, the *Pu-chih-i-lun* (*Nikāya-avalambana-bheda-śāstra*) says about the five points :—

"The four groups of people[34] equally preaching the five heretical doctrines".

Another translation of the treatise, *Shi-pa-pu-lun* (*Aṣṭāda-śa-nikāya-śāstra*) speaks on the same point thus :—

" Three kinds of monks[35] preaching five *sthānas* (places)."

[33] Mr. K. Terajima's edition of *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun*, p. 35.

[34] Cf. Chāng bundle, Vol. IV, p. 80a of Chinese *Tripiṭaka*. The four groups of people are :

(1) Men of big country
(2) Men of border country
(3) Men of learning
(4) Men of virtues.

[35] The three kinds of monks are

(1) Monks of ability.

It therefore, becomes, evident that only Hiuen Tsiang's version of Vasumitra's treatise i.e., the *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* connects with Mahādeva those Five Points, which became the cause of the Mahāsaṅghika separation in the Second Council, but the other versions of the same treatise i.e., the *Pu-chih-i-lun* and *Shi-pa-pu-lun* do not mention any such connection. It is also a significant fact that these three versions agree not only in connecting Mahādeva with the Caityavāda school but also in every detail, as may be commonly expected. It appears, therefore, that Hiuen Tsiang was mistaken.

This mistake of Hiuen Tsiang becomes more significant when we bring the evidences of the Tibetan accounts to our aid. Bhāvya attributes the origin of " the Five Points " to two persons, Bhadra and Mahādeva. He says, about 137 years after the death of Buddha, in the time of the Kings Nanda and Mahāpadma, Māra the wicked, under the name of Bhadra wearing the cloth of the monk exhibited manifold miracles, and owing to the Five Points created a great division in the church.[36] Again the Tibetan translation of Vasumitra's treatise speaks thus—

"It is asserted that a little more than a century after the death of the Blessed Buddha, after the setting of the radiant sun, in the city of Pāṭaliputra, during the reign of king Aśoka, the one ruler of the (whole) land (of India) occurred the schism of the Mahāsaṅghikas. It took place on account of the conception and promulgation of five propositions ". [37]

So we see, that even the Tibetan accounts do not connect Mahādeva with those five points which were the cause of the Mahāsaṅghika separation. They connect them with Bhāvya

(2) Monks who follow the logic of cause and effect.

(3) Monks of learning.

Chang bundle, Vol. IV, p. 80a of Chinese *Tripiṭaka*.

[36] *J. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 415; Rockhill, *Life of Buddha*, p. 186, Gieger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, Introduction, p. lxi.

[37] Rockhill, *Life of Buddha*, p. 187, n.

circa A. B. 137. On the whole it becomes evident that "the Five Points" really existed in the time of the 2nd Council about A. B. 100, but Mahādeva had nothing to do with them at that period. It appears to me that these Five Points came to be connected with Mahādeva later on in the time of Dharma-Aśoka. This Mahādeva was the founder of the Caityavāda School.[38]

Thus it becomes established, that the separation between the Sthaviravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas took place about 100 years after the *Nirvāṇa* of Buddha. The causes of this separation were: Firstly, "the Ten Points" of the Vajjian monks, as the Southern accounts tell us, and secondly, "the Five points" of Bhadra, as the Northern accounts confirm.

I maintain that "the Ten Points" of the Vajjian monks constituted the cause of the outward division in the church, and "the Five Points" of Bhadra the cause of the separation in doctrines.[39]

B. *Indirect Causes.*

So far I have been dealing with the immediate causes that brought about the separation in the Buddhist Church. But it should be noted that these by themselves were not sufficient for the purpose. There were other incidents and matters, occurring in the life time of Buddha, as well as in the period beginning from His death to the Vaiśālī Council, which helped in creating that dissension as the Mahāsaṅghika separation could not be the result of the movement of a single day. There must have been some remote causes. These are of two kinds, (*i*) those which were existing in the time of Buddha,

[38] There are Chinese and Japanese Scholars who think that there were two Mahādevas. But I am constrained to maintain that there was one and he is the founder of the Caityavāda School.

[39] It appears that the original Five Points were not so complicated at first but as they received the stamp of several hands they became gradually complicated in course of time. At last, when they were collected by Mahādeva, the founder of the Caityavāda School, they had taken that complex shape in which we get them now.

(*ii*) those which were existing in the period from Buddha's death to the Second Council of Vaisālī.

(*i*) *Causes which were existing in the time of Buddha.* A religion generally consists of three things: the Founder of the religion, Doctrine, and the Church. A difference of opinion among the adherents generally is concerned with one or other of these three. Such differences of opinion arose in the life time of Buddha. Devadatta could not harmonize with others in his opinion regarding the personality of Buddha, the Doctrines and the Church System and separated, *Cullavagga* records the separation thus :—

1. "Now Devadatta on that day, which was *uposatha* day, arose from his seat, and gave out voting-tickets, saying: 'We went, Sir, to the Samaṇa Gotama and asked for the Five points: 'It would be good, Lord, if the Bhikkhus should be, all their lives long, dwellers in the woods; if whosoever goes to the neighbourhood of a village, should thereby commit an offence. It would be good if they should, all their lives long, beg for alms; if whosoever should accept an invitation, should thereby commit an offence. It would be good if they should clothe themselves, all their lives long, in cast-off rags; if whosoever should accept a gift of robes from a layman, should thereby commit an offence. It would be good if they should dwell, all their lives long, under the trees; if whosoever should (sleep) under a roof, should thereby commit an offence. It would be good if they should, all their lives long, abstain from fish; if whosoever should eat fish, should thereby commit an offence'. These the Samaṇa Gotama will not allow; but we live in accordance therewith. Whosoever of the venerable ones approves of the Five Things, let him take a ticket'.

"Now at that time there were five hundred Bhikkhus, Vesāliyans, and belonging to the Vajjian clan,[40] who had but

[40] Those Vajjians might belong to the same clan as those who had put forward the Ten Points which gave rise to the Second Council of Vaiśālī a hundred years after the Buddha's death. (The translators of the *Cullavagga* have the same opinion, cf. *S. B. E.*, Vol. XX, p. 256, n. 2.)

recently joined the Order, and were ignorant of what he had in hand. These took the voting-tickets, believing (the Five Points, to be according to) the Dhamma, and the Vinaya, and the teaching of the Master. And Devadatta, having thus created a division in the Saṅgha, went out to the hill Gayā-sīsa, taking those five hundred Bhikkhus with him.

"Then Sāriputta and Moggallāna went to the Blessed One, and said to the Blessed One, 'Devadatta, Lord, has gone forth to Gayā-sīsa, taking five hundred Bhikkhus with him'. 'Verily, Sāriputta and Moggallāna, there must be a feeling of kindness towards those young Bhikkhus among you both. Go therefore, both of you, before they have fallen into entire destruction'.

"Even so, Lord,' said Sāriputta and Moggallāna......And rising from their seats,......they set out for Gayā-sīsa.........

2. "Now at that time Devadatta, surrounded by a great number of adherents, was seated, preaching the Dhamma, and when he saw from afar Sāriputta and Moggallāna coming towards him, he said to the Bhikkhus: 'See, O Bhikkhus how well preached must be my doctrine, in that even the two chief disciples of the Samaṇa Gotama—Sāriputta and Moggallāna—are coming to join me, being pleased with my Dhamma'.

"When he had thus spoken, Kokālika said to Devadatta: 'O venerable Devadatta, trust not Sāriputta and Moggallāna, for they are inclined towards evil, and under the influence of evil desires'.

"Nay, my friend, let us bid them welcome since they take pleasure in my teaching (Dhamma)'. And Devadatta invited Sāriputta to share his own seat, saying, 'Come friend Sāriputta, sit thou here'.

"Nay (there is no need of that)' said Sāriputta; and taking another seat......and then made request to Sāriputta, saying: 'The assembly, friend Sāriputta, is still alert and sleepless. Will you, friend Sāriputta, be so good as to think

of some religious discourse to address to the Bhikkhus? My back is tired, and I would stretch myself a little'.

"And Devadatta spread his waist, cloth folded in four on the ground, and lay down on his right side. And in a moment even sleep overcame him who was tired, and had lost his presence of mind and his self-consciousness.

3. "Then the venerable Sāriputta taught and exhorted the Bhikkhus in a religious discourse touching the marvels of preaching, and the venerable Moggallāna taught and exhorted the Bhikkhus in a religious discourse touching the marvels of Iddhi. And whilst they were being so taught and exhorted those Bhikkhus obtained the pure and spotless Eye of the Truth......Then the venerable Sāriputta addressed the Bhikkhus, and said: 'Let us go, my friends, to the Blessed One's side. Whosoever approves of his doctrine (Dhamma). Let him come'.

"And Sāriputta and Moggallāna went back to the Veluvana, taking those five hundred Bhikkhus with them".[41]

Besides the aforementioned secession of Devadatta there are records of several other quarrels in the Buddhist church even in the life time of Buddha. The *Kosāmbī-Jātaka* records one such quarrel which occurred between the Sūtra-Bhānakas and the Vinaya-bhānakas:

"At that time, it is said, two brothers lived in the same house, the one versed in the *Vinaya*, the other in the *Sūtras*. The latter of these one day having occasion to visit the lavatory went out leaving the surplus water for rinsing the

[41] *Cullavagga*, (*S. B. E.*, Vol. XX, pp. 256-259). It should be noted that Fa-Hien tells us that he saw the followers of Devadatta in Central India (Middle Kingdom). They regularly made offering to the three previous Buddhas, Krakuchanda, Konākamuni and Kāśyapa, but not to Śākyamuni Buddha (cf. Legge, *Fa-Hien.*, p. 1, N. 2; p. 62). There are some who include these followers of Devadatta in the Buddhist church. But this is an impossible task. Since the very time of the separation of Devadatta, his followers went outside the pale of the Buddhist church.

It should also be noted that the schism of Devadatta cannot be rightly called a dissension among Buddha's disciples. However there might be some indirect relation of this schism with the later dissensions in the church.

mouth in a vessel. Afterwards the one versed in the *Vinaya* went in and seeing the water came out and asked his companion if the water had been left there by him. He answered, 'Yes, Sir'. 'What! do you know that this is sinful?' 'No, I was not aware of it'. 'Well, brother, it is sinful'. 'Then I will atone for it'. 'But if you did it inadvertently and heedlessly, it is not sinful'. So he became as one who saw no sin in what was sinful. The *Vinaya* scholar said to his pupils, 'This *Sūtra* scholar, though falling into sin is not aware of it'. They on seeing the other brother's pupils said 'your master though falling into sin does not recognize its sinfulness'. They went and told their master. He said, 'This *Vinaya* scholar before said it was no sin and now says it is a sin; he is a liar'. They went and told the others, 'Your master is a liar'. Thus they stirred up a quarrel, one with another. Then the *Vinaya* scholar, finding an opportunity, went through the form of excommunication of the brother for refusing to see his offence. Thenceforth even the laymen who provided necessaries for the priests were divided into factions".[42]

Besides this quarrel, which is directly referred to also in the *Mahāvagga*, we find indirect references to several other conflicts among the disciples. We find Buddha giving instructions several times to his disciples, for refraining from any quarrel whatsoever. These instructions would be meaningless if we do not take it as the result of some actual quarrels in the church. Thus in the *Kosambīya-sūtra* of the *Majjhima-Nikāya* Buddha says:

"Six things, disciples, are worthy to be remembered precious, honourable, leading to harmony, agreement, concord, unity".[43]

[42] Cf. Translation of Jātakas by Francis and Neil, ed. Cowell, Vol. III, p. 289.

[43] Silacara, *Discourse of Gotama, the Buddha*; Vol. II, p. 203; *M. N.*, Vol. I, p. 322; cf. also *M. N.*, Vol. I, p. 206; the *Culagasurgasuttam*:

'And you dwell together in amity, Anuruddha, free from dissension, kindly disposed, precious in one another's sight.'

Again the strict injunction of the *Pātimokkha* on Saṅghadisena is a significant thing :—

Whatsoever Bhikkhu shall go about to cause division in a community that is at union or shall persist in calling attention to some matter calculated to cause division, that Bhikkhu should thus be addressed by the Bhikkhus 'Sir go not about to cause division in a community that is at union nor persist in calling attention to a matter calculated to cause division.'[1]

From an examination of all these provisions which were made against schism in the church it appears to me that most probably there might have been quarrels in the church on religious points and sometimes these conflicts possibly took serious shapes as is evident from the case of the Sūtra-bhāṇakas and the Vinaya-bhāṇakas.[2]

Now what was the reason of these quarrels ? The Buddhist community was a well-organised body. How could party feelings exist there ?

It is a well-known fact that the Saṅgha was constituted of rious elements. There were men of different castes, different natures, different understanding, varying devotion and ideas.

Buddha hated any caste distinction and maintained the equality of all men as far as their social status was concerned.

[1] *S. B. E.*, Vol. xiii. p. 10. Cf. also the account of *Mahaparinibbāna Sutta*—"Ānanda ! when I am gone address not one another in the way in which the brethren have heretofore addressed each other with the epithet that is of *Avusi* (friend). A younger brother may be addressed by an elder with his name or his family name, or the title 'friend.' But an elder should be addressed by a younger brother as 'Sir' or as 'Venerable Sir.'

"When I am gone, Ānanda, let the order if it should so wish, abolish all the lesser and minor precepts," *Div.*, p. 60. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of Buddha*, II, p. 171.

[2] *Cf.* also—

M. N. Madhura Sutta (Vol. II, pp. 84-86)
M. N. Karmakathala (Vol. II, pp. 128-29)
M. N. Assatāyana (Vol. II, p. 147)
M. N. Esuttari (Vol. II, pp. 177-84)
D. N. Ambaṭṭha (Vol. I, p. 197)
Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of Buddha, Vol. II, p. 101.*

He was not willing to make any distinction between high and low, rich and poor. Thus it was possible for the men of all castes to come together in the Buddhist community. This we see even among the principal ten disciples of Buddha.[1]—

Mahākāśyapa Sāriputra Maudgalyāyana Kātyāyana	Brāhmaṇa.
Ānanda Anuruddha Rāhula	Kṣatriya.
Subhūti Pūrṇa	Vaiśya
Upāli	Śūdra.

These men of different castes being influenced by the great personality of the Buddha in his life-time gave up every feeling of distinction between themselves and had no hesitation in living together and taking seats together. But after the death of Buddha, when that influence of Buddha's personality was no more, feelings of distinction naturally came in among them. This feeling became, somewhat deep-rooted, in course of time, in the minds of the disciples and they began to hesitate in living together, or in taking food together.

Again those who come from higher castes generally possess natures more elevated than those who come from low castes. As Buddha did not make any distinction between high and low, these people of different kinds of nature entered into the church. Being influenced by the personality of the Lord they kept in harmony with each other in his life-time after which that harmony broke off.

In this way men of different understanding also assembled in the church. Those who came from higher castes were

[1] As regards the castes of prominent disciples in the church, the *Theragāthā* speaks well. Cf. Translation by Mrs. Rhys Davids, 1913.

generally learned. Thus Sāriputra and Maudgalyāyana were vastly learned and great philosophers. Great fool like Śri Bandhu (?) [1] also could enter the community. They could not certainly harmonize with each other.

That uncultured people could gain admission into the community is borne out by the fact that on one occasion a Brahmin disciple of Buddha on hearing the bad and ungrammatical recitations of a Bhikkhu told Buddha that such recitations could not create any faith among the audience and that on this account such recitations should not be allowed. Since then the Lord asked every one to recite rightly.[2]

Besides then, the *Māhavagga* speaks of certain foolish Bhikkhus who even did not know the day of the month. "People asked," it records "the Bhikkhus who went about for alms 'what day of the half month is this?' The Bhikkhus replied 'we do not know.' The people were annoyed, murmured and became angry. Those Sākyaputtiya Sāmanas do not know even how to count (days), the half month; what good things else will they know?"

Thus it becomes evident that there were both cultured and uncultured monks in the Buddhist community. These conflicting elements in the church certainly could not harmonize with each other and remained prone to any future dissension.

There were again monks of varying devotion. There were some who had been attracted by the august personality of Buddha (*e.g.*, the five Bhikkus of Sarnaṭh); some had been attracted by the eloquence of his speech (*e. g.*, most of the disciples); and some had been attracted by his supernatural power (*e. g.*, Uruvela Kāśyapa).[3] These classes of men had certainly some deep-rooted faith in them in Buddha and his

[1] He was a disciple of Buddha. Cf. Dr. K. Watanabe's '*European Buddhism*,' p. 84. (in Japanese).

[2] *S. B. E.*, Vol. xiii, *Māhavagga*, p. 268.

[3] *S. B. E.*, Vol. xiii, p. 12.

dhamma. But besides there was another class of people who had entered the community, not in faith but either for the maintenance of their livelihood, or for the recovery from diseases or exemption from fighting.[1] These people had faith neither in Buddha nor in Dharma. How could these men be regarded as friends and compatriots by the elevated class of monks in the community? This was also one of the conflicting elements which facilitated the future dissension in the church.

When Buddhism arose there were peoples of various classes who maintained widely different views. Thus in the Brahmajāla-sutta sixty-two different kinds of religious views are mentioned. Thus Dr. Rhys Davids says in his *American Lectures*—

"There is ample evidence even in the books of the orthodox body of Brahmin teachers to show that when Buddhism arose, there was not only much discussion of the ultimate problems of life, and a keen interest in the result, but also that there was a quite unusually open field for all sorts of speculation." He elsewhere notes that such speculations were not less than of eight different kinds.[2]

These different kinds of views and speculations certainly affected the Buddhist life more or less. It appears that those Buddhist monks who had no faith in Buddha and Dharma held one or other of these different kinds of religious views. Thus certain amount of corruption crept into the church and this became manifest in the time of the Mahāsaṅghika separation of which, it might have been an indirect cause.

Another important cause which led to the dissension in the church appears to have been the difference in interpretations given by various kinds of disciples to the same doctrine preached by Buddha. All the disciples were not of the same type; they possessed different capacities for understanding. Thus difference in interpretations was quite natural. The

[1] *S. B. E.*, Vol. xiii, pp. 172, 192, 196, 197.

[2] *American Lectures*, pp. 31-33.

common people also misunderstood Buddha as he always kept aside all philosophical discussions and only spoke about the way to salvation. The favourite philosophical topics of the time were—

(1) Is the world eternal ?
(2) Is the world not eternal ?
(3) Is the world finite ?
(4) Is the world infinite ?
(5) Is the soul same as body ?
(6) Is the soul one thing, and the body another ?
(7) Does one who has gained the truth live again after death ?
(8) Does he not live again after death ?
(9) Does he both live again and not live again after death ?
(10) Does he neither live again, nor not live again after death ? [1]

These were called in early Buddhism 'Ten Āvyā-katāni' the indeterminates i. e., points not determined. Whenever Buddha was asked one or other of these questions he did not reply to it but used to say—

"O Vaccha, speculation such as 'eternality of the world' is a heresy, a wilderness of heresy, a wilderness of heresy, a barren heresy, a show of heresy, a perversion, a felter'. [2]

Sometimes he used to say.—

" It is necessary to come out at once from fire, for those who are in the burning flames and it is necessary to take away the arrow from the body, for those who have been struck with the poisonous arrow, they are quite ignorant, who think about conclusion when they will be coming out of the fire,

[1] *Dialogues of Buddha*, II. Rhys Dayids, pp. 187, 255. Cf. also *S. N.* xxii, 85 *Yamaka*, vol. III, p. 40, xxii. 85, *Anuruddha*, Vol. IV, p. 116.
D. N. Mahānidāna (Vol. II, p. 86).
M. N. Culla Mālunkya (Vol. I, pp. 425-27).
M. N. Aggivacchagotta (Vol. I, p. 484).

[2] *M. N. Aggivacchagotta Sutta*, Vol. I, p. 485.

while they are actually in burning fire; they are also ignorant who, being struck by the poisonous arrow want to know the construction of the arrow without attempting to remove it from the body." [1]

In this way Buddha deliberately refused to enter into philosophical discussions, as he was of the opinion that philosophical questions simply lead to doubt, never to salvation.

However, on this account, it cannot be asserted that he had no philosophical knowledge. After his Enlightenment he obtained the absolute truth which has two aspects—phenomenal and noumenal. So he knew what is truth in the external world as well as what is truth in the internal world. Notwithstanding, he always dealt with the phenomenal world—suffering (Duḥkha), transitoriness (Anitya) and so on. Explanation of these and of the means for withstanding these can only do some definite good to the mass. This is why he always spoke to the people with strict reference to their capacities of understanding, time, the community, the Dharma and the import of the religious precepts.[2] He was very cautious about that his speeches might not have been given in improper time and to persons not able to understand them.

Sometimes, he might have touched philosophical points in his discussions. Some references to such points tend to show that he was a *Vibhajyavādin* as far as his philosophical knowledge is concerned. He never gave any definite idea,—always spoke with reservation. He gave, sometimes, both negative and positive explanations of the same thing. Thus sometimes he said that even a Buddha dies as an ordinary man.[3]

[1] *M. N. Cula-Malunkya Sutta*, Vol. I, p. 29.

[2] *A. N.*, p. 131.

[3] "They all, all beings that have life shall lay, aside their complex form—that aggregation of mental and material qualities.

That gives them or in heaven or on earth,
Their fleeting individuality.
Even as the teacher being such a one,
Unequalled among all the men that are,

Again sometimes he asserted that Buddha's personality is harmonized with absolute truth[1] which is eternity.[2] So Buddha's personality also is eternal.[3]

Buddha's explanation on the world also is similarly ambiguous. Sometimes, he explains it as "all is impermanent (*Sarvaṁ anityaṁ*), all is suffering (*Sarvaṁ duḥkhaṁ*) and all is non-soul (*Sarvaṁ anātmaṁ*)." But sometimes the explanation runs "*Sarvaṁ sukhaṁ, Sarvaṁ nityaṁ, Sarvaṁ Mahātmaṁ.*"

This want of definiteness in the statements of Buddha leads one to call him a *Vibhajyavādin.*

It has been already remarked that the disciples of Buddha were of various types. The difference in caste and in capacities of understanding did not permit them all to give the similar imports to the above *Vibhajyavādi*-doctrines of the Buddha. They, thus, came to hold conflicting opinions about doctrinal affairs.[4] But the attraction for the awe-

Successor of the prophets of old time,
Mighty by wisdom, and insight clear,
Hath died" (*Dial. Bud.*, III, p. 175.)

Cf. also—

"Now the exalted one addressed the venerable Ānanda and said—'It may be, Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise. The word of the master is ended we have no teacher more;' But it is not thus Ānanda that you should regard it. The truths and the rules of the order, which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let after I am gone be the teacher to you". (*Ibid*, p. 171).

[1] Cf. '*Dhammaṁ hi so bhikkhu passati.*'

'*Dhammaṁ passanto maṁ passati.*'

'One who understands Dharma he also understands me and one who understands me he also understands Dharma.' *Itivulttaka*, pp. 91 & 92.

[2] Cf. "They shall reveal the stability of the Law, its being subjected to fixed rules, its unshakeable perpetuity in the world" (*S. B. E.*, Vol. XXI, p. 53).

[3] Cf. "I show the place of extinction. I reveal to (all) being a device (upāyam) to educate them albeit I do not become extinct at the time, and in the very place continue preaching the laws." (*S. B. E.*, Vol. XXI, p. 307).

[4] That these conflicting opinions were existing even in the life-time of Buddha, though not in a definite form, has also been conjectured by other scholars.

The great Chinese scholar Tsz-an-ta-shu says—'Of different persons, on hearing the deep doctrine of Buddha, some understood it narrowly and some deeply—they held different opinions were divided into 20 schools.'

inspiring personality of Buddha prevented them from creating factions in the church. Up to the death of the Buddha they passed on peacefully. But as soon as that personality ceased to influence them they began to give vent to their individual opinions and thus conflicts arose and these took a definite shape in the Second Council. Thus, on the whole, different sorts of corruptions had germinated in the community even in the life-time of Buddha, these could not become manifest then owing to the influence of his personality, but these contributed to the rise of factions as soon as he passed away. These, therefore, may be taken as the indirect causes that helped the Mahāsaṅghika separation that took a serious shape, in the Buddhist church.

(iii) Remote cause arising after Buddha's death:—

After Buddha's death a disciple's corruption was not only emotional and doctrinal but there was corruption regarding Buddha's personality also. It has already been noted that every religion is constituted of three important things—the founder, the doctrine and community. Any quarrel in the church is generally concerned with one or other of these three. With the Buddhist church the case was also similar after Buddha's death. The *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* of Vasumitra and *Kathāvatthu* tell us much about it. The different sorts of doctrines attributed to the 20 schools by these books may be classed as five.[1]

Different opinions upon :—

(1) Cosmology
(2) Nirvāṇa

Bodhi-ruci says—"The same word of Buddha possessed Hīnayānic and Mahāyanic imports."

Tien-tai-ta-shi says—'The same audience of different understanding created difference in doctrines.

Cf. Dr. E. Mayeda's '*History of Mahāyāna Buddhism*,' (Japanese), p. 5.

[1] Mrs. Rhys Davids in her translation of *Kathāvatthu* (contents, p. xiv-xvii) shows us ten different problems of controversy. These may be abridged into five.

(3) Religious practices
(4) Religieux
(5) Buddha-kāya.

Even these five also may be considered under two heads, the 'doctrine' and the 'founder.' It, thus, becomes clear that the remote cause of the separation in church after Buddha's death might have been quarrels upon one or other of the three disputed topics noticed above.

(1) Emotional corruption or corruption among the disciples.—Even during Buddha's life-time emotional corruption had already made its way but it was confined only to individuals. But after the death of Buddha it succeeded in spreading to parties. This is because in Buddha's time any man entering the life of Monk-hood, through some Sthavira, was, in fact, a disciple of Buddha. Buddha was the central figure round which everyone centred. But with the death of Buddha this sort of centralisation was over and the church organisation became divided. Thus, in the century following the death of the Lord we find no unity between Sthaviras preaching in Kosāmbi, and Sthaviras preaching in Avanti or other places. They were preaching independently of each other. The disciples entering the order through these different Sthaviras in different places came to constitute different communities under their respective leaders. There was no more one single head like Buddha round whom all these different communities would centre and through whose influence all these different communities would be united. Even in Buddha's life-time we have observed the conflict between the Sūtra-bhāṇaka and Vinaya-bhāṇaka parties in which each party declined to hear Buddha's instructions.. None can deny, therefore, that these sorts of quarrels between the Sūtra party and the Vinaya party were much more serious than what occurred in the life-time of the Buddha. Such circumstances which appeared after Buddha's death were certainly the remote causes of the Mahāsaṅghika separation.

(2) Corruption regarding the personality of the founder.— In his life-time Buddha was the central figure. But after his death the Dharma or the Vinaya came to be considered as the centre. His personality began to be considered as an object of worship. Thinking on his personality the disciples began to arrive at different views about him who was no longer in their midst. Some attributed all sorts of greatness to him[1] and others who newly entered the community came to possess a peculiar sort of attraction for his departed personality on hearing of the greatness.[2] In course of time the former class of disciples who had seen Buddha went on praising his greatness and the latter came to attribute superhuman characteristics to him and thus made out an Avatāra of him so to say. The Buddha-kāya theory thus originated in the natural way.

[1] "In the self same way, O Brāhmin in this world an accomplished one makes his appearance, an exalted one, a supremely awakened one, perfect in knowledge and in conduct, an auspicious one, a knower of all the worlds, an incomparable guide to men who desire guidance, a teacher of gods and men, and awakened one, a blessed one, and having of himself known and his centre universe of gods and men with its deities and māras and Brahmas and its race of ascetics and recluses, he imparts his knowledge to others". (*Discourses of Gotama the Buddha* by Silacara, Vol. ii, p. 259 Eng. Transl. of *M N. Hattipadapama* Vol. I. p. 179).

Also cf.

M. N.—*Rathapāla* (Vol. II. p. 55).
Taṇhasankhāya (Vol. I., p. 267).
Brahmāyu (Vol. II. p. 133).
Salayāka (Vol. I, p. 401).

D. N.—*Ambaṭṭha.* 1.2 (Vol. I., p. 87).
Śoṇadaṇḍa, (I, p. iii).
Kūṭadanta 2 (Vol. I. pp. 127-8).
Tevijja 7 (Vol. I, p. 236).
Lohicca 3 (Vol. I, p. 225).
Mahali 1 (Vol. III, p. 159).

S. *N.* xxii, 78 Siha (Vol. III, p. 85).

A. *N.* Vol. III. p. 30.

[2] 'If we hear that we would be able to see Buddha Bhagavan, we should go ten yojana, twenty yojanas, thirty yojanas, even one hundred yojanas and one thousand yojanas to pay respect to Bhagavan. But Buddha is no more so we shall take refuge in the Buddha who has attained parinirvāṇa and in the Dharma and Saṅgha.' *M. N. Çhotamukha*, Vol. II, pp. 162-163).

It is to be noted that even in Buddha's time, many disciples privately or publicly asked the Buddha whether he would die or not (*tathāgato param maraṇa vāna tathāgato param maraṇa*). But Buddha never answered to this kind of questions definitely. Sometimes he said that even the Buddha dies and sometimes he said that Buddha is the eternal truth and as such he is eternal. Hence some [1] came to think of Buddha as impermanent like ordinary human beings whereas others [2] maintained that Buddha-kāya is as permanent as eternal truth. These two aspects of the Buddha-kāya theory became the most important problems after the death of Buddha. These different views on the Buddha-kāya constituted another very important remote cause of the Mahāsaṅghika separation.

(3) Doctrinal corruption.—It has been already noticed that after the death of Buddha the Dharma or Vinaya became the guiding principle of the disciples—practically a centre so to say. The *Mahāparinibbāṇa-Sutta* testifies to it.

"Now the exalted one, addressed the venerable Ananda and said, it may be Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise 'the word of the Master is ended, we have no teacher more!' But it is not thus, Ānanda, that you should regard it. The truth and the rules of the order, which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them after I am gone, be the teacher to you." [3]

Thus it becomes evident that the Dhamma or Vinaya became the centre of the Buddhist community after Buddha's death. This can not but be as any community solely depends upon doctrines and church-regulations in the absence of the founder.

It is also important to note that the conflict between the Sūtrabhāṇakas and the Vinayabhānakas as recorded in the

[1] Cf. Sthaviravādins and Sarvāstivādins.

[2] Cf. Mahāsaṇghikas and others.

[3] D. N. VI. I; *Dialogues of Buddha*, III, p. 171.

Kosāmbi-Jātaka tends to show that even in the lifetime of Buddha two sorts of tendencies had come to exist among the disciples—one to consider the Vinaya as the most important thing and the other to consider the Sūtra, the doctrine—the most important thing. It also appears to be probable that after Buddha's death different kinds of *bhānakas* came into existence[1] and they had to quarrel with each other as they maintained different kinds of views.

It should be noted also that in course of time there arose conflicts among the Vinaya party itself and also the Sūtra party itself. This is especially indicated in a passage of the Vinayapiṭaka.

Thus—

"Venerable Ânanda being asked by Mahākāsyapa spoke to the Thera Bhikkhus 'The Blessed One Sir, at the time of his passing away spoke thus to me; "when I am gone Ânanda let the Saṅgha if it so wishes revoke all the lesser and minor precepts."' (Book of the great Decease VI. 3).

[1] My friend Dr. B. M. Barua pointed out to me that in the *Milindapañha* different *bhānakas* are mentioned viz:—

Suttantika (Master in Suttanta)
Venāyika (Master in Vinaya)
Abhidhammika (Master in abhidhamma)
Dhammakathika (repeaters of Jātaka)
Dīghabhanaka (" of Digha)
Majjhima " (" of Majjhima)
Samyutta " (" of Samyutta)
Anguttara " (" of Anguttara)
Khuddaka " (" of Khuddaka)

Cf. *Milindapañho* by Trenckner, p. 343, S.B.E., Vol. xxxvi, p. 231.

Of course we cannot believe that during the period from the First Council to Second Council there were Abhidhammabhānakas as mentioned in the Milinda list. The above list definitely points out that there were bhānakas and specialists in all those different subjects—Sūtra, Vinaya, etc. Curiously enough that even in modern times there are many Buddhist Schools in China and Japan, some of which have estimation for the Vinaya and some others for the Sūtra. There is one other sect called the dhyāna sect which has absolute faith in Abhidhamma. This school maintains the efficacy of dhyāna. It appears that all these different schools came to exist through the influence of the bhānaka orders in India as such schools in China and Japan had been mostly founded by Indian Pandits who had gone there. It seems, therefore, that such different schools in China and Japan presuppose some sectarian bhānaka orders in the mother land of Buddhism.

"The Thera Bhikkhus asked Ânanda 'Did you then, venerable Ânanda, ask the Blessed one which were the lesser and minor precepts?' and his answer was simply 'No Sir.'"

Some Theras then said that all the rules save the four Pārājikas; others that all save those and the thirteen Saṁghādidesas; others that all save those and the two Aniyatas; others that all save those and the thirty Nissaggiyas; others that all save those and the ninety two Pācittiyas; others that all save those and four Patidesaniyas were lesser and minor precepts, then the Venerable Mahākāsyapa laid a resolution before the Saṁgha; 'Let the Venerable Saṁgha hear me, there are certain of our precepts which relate to matters in which the laity are concerned. Now the laity know of us that "such and such things are proper for you Sāmanas who are Sākyaputtiyas, and such and such things are not" if we were to revoke the lesser and minor precepts, it will be said to us. "A set of precepts was laid down for his disciples by the Sāmana Gotama to endure until the smoke should rise from his funeral pyre, so long as their teacher remained with these men, so long did they train themselves in the precepts, since their teacher has passed away from them, no longer do they now train themselves in the precepts."

'If the time seem meet to the Saṁgha, not ordaining what has not been ordained, and not revoking what has been ordained, let it take upon itself and ever direct itself in the precepts according as they have been laid down, this is the resolution. Let the Venerable Saṁgha hear me. (These things being so) the Saṁgha take upon itself the precepts according as they have been laid down, whosoever of the Venerable ones approves thereof, let him keep silence. Whosoever approves not thereof, let him speak, the Saṁgha has taken upon itself the precepts according as they were laid down. Therefore does it keep silence. Thus do I understand."[1]

[1] *Cullavagga*, XI. 1. *S.B.E.*, Vol. XX. pp. 377-378.

But Mahākāsyapa being the most orthodox Sthavira urged on implicit obedience to the whole Vinaya without omitting any part.

The *Dharmajuptaka-Vinaya*[1], however, speaks thus—'Venerable Purana with five hundred Bhikkhus came to Rājagaha where the Theras had completed their recitation of Dhamma and Vinaya. Then Mahākāsyapa said to him that Dhamma and Vinaya had been chanted over together by the Theras and asked him to submit. Venerable Purana submitted but he strongly differed with Mahākāsyapa on eight points[2] of the Vinaya.

Thus it becomes clear that Mahākāsyapa was very conservative and this is why he required implicit reliance upon the Vinaya of Buddha and preservation of it intact. Purana however appears to have been a man of progressive and advanced nature. This is why he did not care about the form but for the spirit. He did not think that the change of some portions of the Vinaya would bring about any material loss in Buddhism. But as Kāsyapa was the leader in the church and as Anuruddha arrived late the former became the gainer whereas the latter was unsuccessful in his protest. This occurred in the First Council.[3] It appears that these sorts of differences on Vinaya was one of the remote causes of separation.

This is also confirmed by an account of the Khai-yuen-shih-ciao (Catalogue of Buddhist MSS. compiled in the Khai-yuen period 1713-41). It records that Hiuen Tsiang brought to China seven different kinds of Vinaya from India, viz.—the Vinayas of Vinaya from India—viz., the Vinayas of the Sthaviras, of the Mahāsaṅghikas, of the Sarvāstivādins, of the

[1] Vol. 54 p. 51 a. of Lie Bundle No. 6, Ko-kio-sho-in Edition. Sometimes it is called the *Caturvarga-Vinaya*, translated by Buddhayasa, together with *Cu-fo-nien* A.D. 405 of the Later Tsin dynasty—384-417 A.D. See Nanjio's catalogue No. 1117.

[2] These are—(i) To cook inside room; (ii) to cook himself; (iii) to take food himself directly without being asked; (iv) early to take food in the morning; (v) to receive food from others; (vi) to take fruits himself directly.

[3] Dr. B. Matsumoto's '*On Buddhist councils*' Vol. I., p. 51 (in Japanese).

Sammitiyas, of the Mahiśāsakas, of the Kāśyapiyas and of the Dharma-guptakas. This certainly indicates that different schools possessed different kinds of Vinaya.

Now was there any such corruption in Dhamma also? It has been already noticed that even during the lifetime of Buddha different disciples possessing different nature gave different interpretations to the same speech of Buddha. This is because Buddha sometimes preached what he attained through his self introspectional perception. This consisted of absolute truth which possesses diverse aspects. Thus what Buddha preached possesed necessarily diverse aspects. Thus it appears, after Buddha's death his disciples without clearly grasping what Buddha meant they emphasized on one or other of the many aspects. This is why we find different kinds of doctrines maintained by different schools, *e.g.* the Sarvāstivādins maintained that everything exists in three Kālas, past, present and future while the Mahāsaṅghikas maintained that there is no existence of past or future and present only exists.

Thus it may be rightly conjectured that these peoples who held different opinions came to be separated from each other after the death of Buddha and such schools, as the Sarvāstivadin and the Mahāsaṅghika were formed.

On the whole it becomes evident that the Mahāsaṅghika separation in 2nd Council was due not only to such immediate causes as the Vajjian's Ten points but also to certain remote causes which had come into existence even in the lifetime of Buddha.

It may be noted in passing, here, that the period beginning with Buddha's death and ending with the Second Council was a period of internal conflicts like the Upanishadic period. Heated discussions were being carried on but these discussions had not yet been systematised. Different opinions only had come into existence but the peoples holding them had not yet founded separate schools. These were done after the

Second Council and the first step taken towards that direction was the Mahāsaṅghika separation.

A question may be naturally asked here, that if there had been such remote causes of the separation even during the first century after Buddha's death then what were the impediments in the formation of schools during that period?

It may be noticed that inspite of the minute discussions and speculations on Buddha's personality, on Dhamma or on Saṅgha during the first century after Buddha's death the disciples possessed so deep a faith in Buddha that they did not like to separate themselves. Besides, the community was under the strict government of successive leaders. This succession of leaders was strong enough to protect the community against any possible corruption. Or, in other words, though the disciples individually maintained conflicting views and ideals as far as Vinaya, Dhamma, and Buddha's personality were concerned yet they were not still in a position to enforce these on others and thus to create different schools being under the strict supervision of different leaders. Now another question may arise whether there was any such succession of heads in the Buddhist church? I would like to reply in the affirmative here.

The Northern Buddhists agree in maintaining that there were five successive chiefs in the community from Buddha's death up to the 2nd Council. The names given in the Northern Records[1] are :—

[1] (i) *Aśoka-Raja-Sūtra*—Chang Bundle No. 10; P. 48a, of Tripiṭaka, Ko-kio-sho-in Edition. Nanjio—No. 1343.

(ii) *Dharmatrāta-dhyāna-Sūtra.* Chang Bundle No. 8, p. 468. Nanjio, No. 1341.

(iii) Record on the Nidāna or cause of transmitting the Dharmapiṭaka—*Ibid.* No. 9, p. 906. Nanjio—No. 1340.

(iv) *Mahasarvāstivada-nikāya-vinaya-samyuktavastu*, Han bundle, No. 2, p. 39a. Nanjio No. 1121.

(v) *Sāriputra-paripṛcchā-Sūtra*, Ibid, No. 10, p. 18a. Nanjio 452.

(vi) Tibetan *Dulva* —(vinaya) of the Sarvāsti-vādins, *cf.* Rockhill's *Life of Buddha*, pp. 168-170.

Mahākāśyapa, Ânanda, Madhyantika,[1] Sonāvāsika, Upagupta.

The Southern Records[2] also give another list of the leaders in the church.

Upāli, Dāsaka, Sonaka Siggava and Moggaliputta Tissa.

The Northern tradition says that the Sthaviravādins are divided in the time of Upagupta[3] which the Southern tradition maintains that they split up in the time of Moggaliputta Tissa. Fa-Hien also in his introduction to the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya[4] states that in the time of Upagupta the Buddhist community was divided into five groups for the first time—Dharmaguptakas, Mahiśāsakas, Kāsyapiyas, Sarvāstivādins, and Mūlasthaviravādins.

The traditions agree in making Upagupta a contemporary of Aśoka and in placing him in 110 years after the death of Buddha. The Asoka spoken of is certainly Dharmāśoka. The *Asokā-vadāna* also makes him a contemporary of the Buddhist Emperor.[5]

[1] It should be noticed here that according to the *Dharmatrāta-Sūtra* and Tibetan *Dulva*—the names are—Mahākāśyapa, Ânanda, Mādhyantika, Śonaka and Upagupta. But the Record on the Nidāna or cause of transmitting the Dharmapiṭaka records four names and excludes the name of Madhyantika. (*cf.* Nanjio—No. 1340). The Ceylonese chronicles record that Mādhyantika went to Kāshmir and Gandhara for preaching in the time of Dharmāśoka. So unless and until we get such information as that there were two Mādhyantikas—one disciple of Ânanda another the preacher the evidence of the Southern Mādhyantika who was the disciple of Ânanda cannot be believed. It appears that the Madhyantika of Aśoka's time has been confused.

[2] *Dipavaṁsa* 4. 27 ; 5, 99 ; Translation by Oldenberg, pp. 136-45. *Mahâvaṁsa*—Greiger's Transl. pp. 32-39 ; V. 73-155 *Sāmantapāsādikā*.

Intro. to *Vin. Pit.*, Vol. III. pp. 292-293.

[3] *Short History of the Eight sects* by Giyo-nen-dai-toku with Mr. K. Sakaino's Commentary, Vol. I, p. 26.

[4] Lie bundle No. 10, p. 82a.

[5] According to *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun*—the division among the Sthaviravādins themselves took place in 300-400 A.B. (*cf.* Mr. J. Masuda's translation. *J. L., I. Calcutta Uni.*, pp. 6-7). The five groups mentioned by Fa-hien all belong to the Sthaviravādins. It becomes evident therefore that as the Sthaviravādin Separation falls in the time of Dharmāśoka there can be no objection in making Upagupta a contemporary of Dharmāśoka.

A difficulty however arises here. According to Southern Records the Sthaviravādin Separation took place from 100 A. B.—200 A. B. (*i.e.* the times of the 1st and 2nd

Now it is a significant fact that two different lists of chiefs are given by Northern and the Southern Records. The list of the Southern Records begins with Upāli, the great master of Vinaya, and the Northern Records begin with Mahākāśyapa, the great master of Sutra.[1] It appears from this that of the two lists one was made from the standpoint of the Vinayabhānakas and the other from that of the Sūtrabhānakas.

Thus it becomes evident that up to the Second Council the succession of heads in the church was so unbroken and strong that even those who became Mahāsaṅghikas afterwards and who maintained revolutionary ideas, were not in a position to separate themselves till the session of the 2nd Council.

In short from the standpoint of an outsider the disciples still constituted an organised body but from that of an insider the disciples had been already maintaining different views and were growing ripe for separation.

Councils). But according to the Northern Records the date is, as stated before, 300-400 A. B. *i.e.*, in the time of Aśoka. How can these glaring inconsistencies be explained away ?

To my mind a reconciliation of these apparently conflicting records is possible. The *Kathāvatthu* records different sets of conflicting opinions only. None of these sets is attributed to any school. Buddhaghoṣa however is more definite in his commentary. He attributes those different sets to different schools. It appears to me that Kathāvatthu which is professedly a book of Aśoka's time records the different opinions in the exact forms in which they had been prevailing at that time. Different schools had not yet been formed. But Buddhaghoṣa being a writer of the Post-Aśokan period could find the schools in their definite shapes which had come into existence by that time. This is the reason why the Southern records and the Northern records vary in their dates.

[1] It has been already stated that the Kosāmbiya-Sūtra records the conflict between Vinayabhāṇakas and the Sūtrabhāṇakas. Such conflicts might have been the cause of difference in the list of leaders also. Those who maintained the superiority of Vinaya considered the masters of Vinaya as the real heads of the church while those who maintained the superiority of Sūtra considered the masters of the Sūtra as the real heads of the church

Thus of the Sthaviras those who went to Ceylon with Mahinda believed in the succession of the masters of Vinaya and those who went away to Kāshmir believed in the succession of the masters of Sūtra, as is known from the Sarvāstivāda tradition also. This is why Moggaliputta Tissa is stated to be the head of the church by the Ceylonese records while Upagupta is believed to be the head by the Northern Sthaviras.

III

The Separation of the Different Schools.

It is rather difficult to make out the chronological order of the separation of different schools. The Southern tradition says that both the Sthaviravādin and Mahāsaṅghika schools were themselves subdivided into minor schools during the period 100 A.B.—200 A.B. But the Northern tradition records that only the Mahāsaṅghikas were subdivided during that period; the Sthaviras were subdivided in the century following.[1]

It is, however, admitted on all hands that the Mahāsaṅghikas separated from the Sthaviravādins in the Second Council about 100 A.B. The Sthaviras formed the most conservative party while the Mahāsaṅghikas who could not harmonise with these Sthaviras advocated complete freedom in thinking as well as in observing the injunctions of the Dharma. It appears from this that the conservative characters most probably saved the Sthaviras from any internal quarrel and consequent separation for sometime but the Mahāsaṅghikas evidently could not keep themselves intact. The freedom they advocated was an obstacle to this. They themselves were most probably separated, after their formal alienation from the Sthaviras. Thus the tradition most probably rightly records that the Mahāsaṅghikas were divided four times into nine schools during the hundred years following the session of the 2nd Council (100-200 A.B.). These schools are

I. Ekavyavahārika
Lokottariya
Kaukkutika (gokulika)

[1] As to the number of the schools traditions vary. The Northern ttradiion states it sometimes as 20 in number (including Mūla-Sthaviravādins and Mahāsāṅghikas) and sometimes as 18 (excluding the two). But Southern tradition states the number as 24.

II. Bahuśrūtiya
III. Prajñaptivādins
IV. Caityaśaila
Aparaśaila
Uttaraśaila

As to the Sthaviras they managed to remain peaceful during this period. Towards the beginning of the next century (200-300 A.B.) they went away to Kashmir almost being driven away by the Mahāsaṅghikas in the Third Council.[1]

When the cause of the Sthaviras in Kashmir became weakened through the growing influence of the Mahāsaṅghikas internal dissension began to arise even within themselves and during the same century (200-300 A.B.) they were divided seven times into ten subsects :

I. Sarvāstivādins (Hetuvādins)
II. Vatsagotriyas from the Sarvāstivadins
III. Dharmottariyas, Sammitiyas, Sannagārikas } from the Vatsagotriyas
IV. Mahiśāsakas from the Sarvāstivādins
V. Dharmaguptikas from the Mahiśāsakas
VI. Kāśyapiyas from the Sarvāstivādins
VII. Sautrāntikas[2] from the Sarvāstivadins.

One difficulty however arises here. The Ceylonese Buddhists trace their lineage from the Sthaviravādins of Magadha. If the Sthaviravādins had gone away to Kashmir how can this be possible. It appears to me that Mahinda went away to Ceylon in a time when the Sthaviras had not

[1] Cf. My article "*Shifting, etc.,*" in *J. L. Calcutta University*, Vol. I, p. 24.
[2] The Sautrāntika school separated not in the century aforementioned (200-300 A.B.) but somewhat later in the next century.

yet left Magadha. So there is nothing inconsistent in the claim of the Ceylonese Buddhists.

Some general observations :—Of course in the earliest stage the schools differed from each other on the views maintained by them about the Buddhist doctrine and the personality of Buddha. But it seems that in course of time this difference deepened and the schools began to differ from each other on many other points. Thus in the second stage of the schools, they differed on the interpretations given to some parts of the Tripiṭaka. But in the third stage, it appears, the difference became established and it consisted in use of languages, ways of wearing the clothes, colours of the clothes,[1] etc.

As to the languages Vinītadeva, [2] who flourished in the 8th century A.D., says that

The Sarvāstivādins used Sanskrit.
The Mahāsanghikas used Prākrit.
The Sammitiyas used Apabhraṁśa.
The Sthaviravādins used Paiśācī. [3]

Vinītadeva's statement is only confined to the main schools. That the languages of the minor schools were different from each other appears to be possible also. Moreover, there is no reason for denying the statement of Vinītadeva as it is confirmed by other evidences.

Thus Mahāvastu, which is a work of the Mahāsaṅghikas is written in a kind of Sanskritised Prākrit. Again Dr.

[1] It may noticed here that the commentary of *I-pu-tsun-lun-lun* (by Kuei-ki) records that the Mūla-sthaviravādins could not retain their position in Kashmir through the growing influence of the Mahāsaṅghikas and went away to the Himālayas. This is why they are called the Haimavantas. *Cf.* Dr. E. Maeda's *History of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (Japanese), p. 79; Rockhill's *Life of Buddha*, p. 182.

[2] It may be noted here that in Japan especially though the different schools speak in the same Japanese language, they differ in their sūtras, clothes.

[3] He flourished about the 8th century, some time after Dharmakirti—

Cf. M.M. S. C. Vidyabhushan's ' Indian Logic, Dr. M. Anesaki's, p. 119. '*Consideration of the Indian religious history*, p. 543 (Japanese).

Grierson [1] points out that Paiśāci was the dialect used in the North Western Frontier provinces. It has been also noticed that the Sthaviras went away thither. There is, therefore, no reason to disbelieve in the account given by Vinītadeva regarding the Sthaviras.

It is distinctly stated in a chapter of the *Abhiniskramaṇa-sutra* [2] that different schools had different versions of the same book.

'Some people ask what is this Sūtra (Buddhacarita) called.

The Mahāsaṅghikas call it Mahāvastu, the Sarvāstivādins Mahāvyūha or Lalita-Vistara, the Kāśyapiyas Nidāna or Avadāna, the Dharmaguptikas Buddhacarita and the Mahiśāsakas Vinayapiṭakamūla.' [3]

Thus it becomes evident that different schools called the *Buddhacarita* in different names. It appears from this, I think, that the literatures of the different schools varied from each other in several respects especially in language and matter.

Then again Vinītadeva also informs us that chivara of the Sarvāstivādins was 9 ft. or 24 ft, long, of the Mahāśaṅghikas 7 ft. or 23 ft. long, of the Mahiśāsakas 5 ft. or 21 ft. long.[4]

Next according to the Sāriputra-paripriccha-sutra[5] robes of different colours were used by the different schools. Thus the Sarvāstivādins used white robe, the Mahāsāṅghikas yellow, the Dharmottariyas red, the Mahiśāsakas green and the Kāśyapīyas magnotia.

[1] *Sir R. G. Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, p. 120.

[2] Translated by Jñānagupta (587 A. D.) of the Sui dynasty 581-618 A. D.

[3] Nanjio's *Catalogue* No. 680: End of No. 9 of the Shon bundle, Tripitaka of the Ko-kio-sho-in Ed.

[4] Dr. M. Anesaki's '*Consideration of the Indian Religious history*,' p. 548.

Curiously enough that all the Chinese and Japanese schools use chivaras of different lengths. This also corroborates Vinītadeva's statement.

[5] No. 10 of the Hun bundle, p. 19.

It becomes evident again from what I-tsing records that there were different ways also in wearing the clothes.

"The distinction of the four Nikāyas (schools) is shown by the difference of wearing the Nivasana (*i.e.*, under-garment), the Mūla-sarvāstivāda-nikāya pulls up the spirit on both sides, (draws the end through the girdle and suspends them over it), whereas the Mahāsaṅghika-nikāya takes the right skirt to the left side and presses it tight (under the girdle) so as not to let it loose; the custom of wearing the under-garment of the Mahāsaṅghikanikāya is similar to that of Indian women, the rules (of putting on the under-garment) of the Sthaviranikāya and of the Sammiti-nikāya are identical with those of the Mahāsaṅghika-nikāya, except that the former (the Sthavira and Sammiti) leave the ends of the skirt outside, while the latter presses it inwardly as mentioned above, the make of the girdle (Kâyabandhana) is also different." I-Tsing by Dr. T. Takakusu, p. 66.

It also appears from Vinītadeva's statement that in different schools the Bhikkhus were addressed with different appellations.[1]—

Sarvāstivādins	...	Mati, Sriprabha,
Mahāsaṅghikas	...	Mitra, Jñāna, Gupta,
Sthaviravādins	...	Deva, Varman, Sena, Jiva, Bala.
Sammitya	...	Dāsa, Seva, Sila, Candra, Guhya.

It is again stated in connection with the life of Hiuen Tsiang[2] that Fa-Hien brought different Sūtras, Vinaya, and Abhidhamma of different schools from India. He brought 14 vols. of the Sarvāstivādin Sūtra, Vinaya and Abhidhamma, 15 Volumes of the Mahāsaṅghika and 22 volumes of the Mahiśāsaka, 17 volumes of the Kāśyapiya, 42

[1] Dr. Anesaki's *Considerations* etc., p. 548.

[2] *Khai-Yuen-shih-ciao-lu*, catalogue of the Teaching of Sâkyamuni, compiled in the Kha-yuen period 713-741 A.D.

Tripiṭaka of the *Ko-kio-sho-in Ed.* Vol. 8, Kio bundle No. 4, p. 772

volumes of the Dharmaguptika and 67 volumes of the Sarvāstivādins.[1]

Thus it becomes quite clear that the schools did not differ only on doctrinal matters, they differed from each other even in outward marks, in preserving different Tripiṭakas and so on.

I should notice here that this article is meant as an introduction to my forthcoming history of the Eighteen schools, already prepared by me. It will be published in the University Journal of Letters very soon.

[1] Cf. also I-tsing's record, Intro. p. xxiii.

Ārya-mahāsāṅghika Tripiṭaka	... 300,000 slokas.
Ārya-sthaviranikāya Tripiṭaka	... 300,000 slokas.
Āryamula-sarvāstivādin Nikāya Tripiṭaka ...	... 300,000 slokas.
Ārya Sammitiya Nikāya Tripiṭaka	... 200,000 slokas.

The fact that the different Vinayas above referred to exist even now of the statement made in connection with the Life of Hiuen Tsiang, cf. Dr. Nanjio's catalogue—Nos. 1,111, 1,117, 1,118, 1,119, 1,122, 1,135.

SINDHI LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

KHAN BAHADUR KALIC-BEG F. MIRZA,

Retired Deputy Collector, Hyderabad, Sind.

In every country the primitive language of the people has been rude and simple, but as they have risen in the scale of civilization, their language too has improved gradually. This refinement of the language is effected by the same means and processes as have caused the growth of its civilization and which build up the history of that nation. One important factor in this process of improvement is its contact with other nations. The effect of such contact is very far-reaching, when one nation becomes the pupil of another in respect of its civilization. Such, for instance, are the classical elements (Greek and Roman) in all the European languages or the Arabic borrowings by Persian, Turkish and other languages. As a further result, the classical languages like Greek, Latin and Sanskrit became permanent stores to be drawn upon consciously by the learned in their quest of new expressions. Hence the mixing of communities by immigration or conquest is always accompanied by a mixture of tongues in various degrees in accordance with the special conditions of each case.

Thus the culture and the history of the people are reflected in its language and literature. The intellectual moral, or political condition of nations at a particular period can easily be guessed from the language.

There is an Arabic proverb that the people follow the religion. Religion here means not merely faith, but manners and customs, including dress and etiquette, social and political institutions. Language is, so to say, like a thermometer or

barometer, for indicating the rise and fall of civilization. "The literature of a people," says Henry Morley, "tells its life. History records its deeds, but literature brings to us the appetites and passions, the keen intellectual debate, the higher promptings of the soul, whose blended energies produced the substance of the record. We see some part of a man's outward life, and guess his character but do not know it, as we should, if we heard also the debate within, loud under outward silence, and could be spectators of each conflict, for which lists are set within the soul. Such witnesses we are through our language and literature of the life of our own country."

Exactly along the same lines has been the growth of the Sindhi language, which in its present form contains evident marks of all the different nations and civilizations which have been recorded in the history of Sind from the earliest times up to the present. The language of Sindhi Mahomedans is different from that of the Sindhi Hindus. Even among the Hindus of Sind, there are some who speak Hindi, while others speak the present hybrid Sindhi. The dialect of the Kohistan or hilly parts of the country (Kachho) is different from that of the Frontier, which again differs from that of the sandy desert of Thar-Parker. The speech of the northern part of Sind (Utar) is different from that of the Southern part (Lar); and that of the Central part (Wicholo) is different from either, and this last is considered the standard dialect of the Province, and is consequently the medium of Vernacular education. Then there are the mixed dialects like Siraiki or Sindhi mixed with Punjabi; Thareli or Sindhi mixed with Marwari, Kachhi and Gujarati; and Balochki and Brohiki or Sindhi mixed with Pashtu and Balochi.

Genealogically speaking, the Sindhi language belongs to the Indian branch of the great Aryan family, but it has been also profoundly influenced by languages of the Iranian branch.

Sindhi being originally a language of the Hindus contains

a very large number of words derived or corrupted from Sanskrit, through Prakrit. A good number of them, however, are purely original native Sindhi (*deśīya*) words; and the rest are through Arabic, Persian, Turkish and other languages. It is estimated that there are in Sindhi about 12,000 words of Sanskrit origin, 3500 pure native Sindhi, 2500 from Arabic and 2000 from Persian and other tongues. But it may be said, to the credit of the Sindhi language, that she has retained many more original forms than the sister vernaculars of India. Captain (afterwards Sir Richard) Burton, who is considered an authority on this subject, writes: "The Sindhi dialect is a language perfectly distinct from any spoken in India. It is spoken with many varieties from the Northern boundary of Kattywar as far north as Bhawalpur and extends from the hills to the West to the Desert which separates Sind from the Eastern portion of the Indian peninsula...Its grammatical structure is heterogeneous, the noun and its branches belonging to the Sanskrit, whereas the verb and adverb are formed, apparently, upon the Persian model. The dialect abounds in Arabic words, which, contrary to the usual rule in India and Central Asia, constitute the common, not the learned. ... Pure as well as corrupted Sanskrit words, perfectly unintelligible to unlearned nations of the Indian Peninsula, are perpetually occurring in Sindhi."

Dr. Ernest Trumpp, a German scholar and probably the greater authority in Sindhi, gives the following opinion,—"Sindhi is a pure Sanskritic language, more free from foreign elements than any other of the North Indian Vernaculars and is much more closely related to the old Prakrit than the Marathi, Hindi, Panjabi or Bengali of our days."

The name Sindhi is from the Sanskrit word *Sindhu*, which means a great river and was applied to the Indus, called *Mehran* in ancient Sindhi. Up to the seventh century of the Christian era, Sind remaind under Aryan rulers, Buddhists

and Hindu. Then came conquerors of the Semitic race, Arabs and others, who continued their invasions up to the tenth century. Then came the Moghals who ruled up to the middle of the nineteenth century. Last of all came the English. The different languages of all these ruling nations are represented in Sindhi by a large number of borrowed words and phrases, which appear either in the original or a more or less corrupted form. A few examples of such loan words may be of interest :—

1. Arabic—*masit*, a mosque (Ar. *masid*); *kurfu*, a lock (Ar. *kufl*); *bassaru*, onion (Ar. *basal*).

2. Persian—*malam*, ointment (Per. *marham*); *sugunu*, an omen (Per. *shugun*); *kagar*, paper (Per. *kaghaz*).

3. Turkish—*borchi*, a cook (Turk. *bawarchi*); *tukmon*, a button (Turk. *dogmah*); *khachar*, a mule (Turk. *katar*).

4. Balochi—*wagu*, a herd of camels (Bal. *bag*); *dumu* a singer or bard (Bal. *dombah*); *chicha*, the little finger (Bal. *chuch*).

5. Pashtu or Afghan—*dodo*, a cake of bread (Push. *dodai*); *jandu*, a handmill (Push *jandrah*); *chhera*, shot (Push. *chirah*).

6. English—*paltan*, troops (Eng. *battalion*); *gudam*, a store-house (Eng. *godown*); *darjan* (Eng. *dozen*).

Sindhi literature has been, up to the present not very extensive. Literature usually implies writing. It is, however, not possible in the case of Sindhito know what the original characters were in which it was written. Very likely they were resembled the ancestors of the present Gurmukhi characters. The modern Hindu-Sindhi form of writing, used by Banias and traders, has no separate vowel marks, and seems to be the descendant of the ancient Sindhi writing. But with the Arab conquest, the Arabic alphabet was introduced into Sind and the written characters have been ever since Arabic-Sindhi, as distinct from the Hindu-Sindhi, mentioned above. Arabic and Persian languages were taught extensively in

Sind by Mullahs and Akhunds and so Sindhi also came to be written in the same characters, even though there was some difficulty at first about the expression of sounds peculiar to Sindhi. But it was managed by inventing some fresh marks and by adding additional points to the Arabic and Persian letters to express the pure Sindhi sounds. Such was the state of the written language up to the rule of the Talpur Mirs or the Baloches. And in 1853, when Mr. (afterwards Sir Bartle) Frere was the Commissioner in Sind, the Court of Directors of the Hon. East India Company ordered that the Sindhi alphabet should be fixed on the model of Arabic and Persian alphabets and all the officers in the civil employ were required to pass an examination in colloquial Sindhi. Till then, the administration was carried on through interpreters and records were kept in mongrel Persian. Soon after, vernacular schools were established by the newly formed Educational Department, and subsequently, about 1865, a large number of indigenous vernacular schools, were also brought under the Department by grant-in-aid system.

Very soon after the British rule had commenced books began to be printed in lithograph presses, and later on Sindhi type was introduced, first by Dr. Trumpp and then by the Government and other private publishers. The first Sindhi books to be printed were some religious books from old Sindhi poetry. Soon after this, the *baits*, or couplets in *dohra* form modelled on the old Hindi metre, of Sayed Abdul Karim of Bulri, were published at Bombay.

At first Sindhi poetry consisted of *dohras* or couplets in the *bhāṣā* or the ordinary poetry in imitation of those by the Hindu poet-saints Guru Nanak, Tulsidas, Surdas, Kabir and Farid. It was this *bhāṣā* poetry that suggested the *dohras* of Shah Abdul Karim and later the *baits* and *wais* of Shah Abdul Latif. Ancient Sindhi poetry was a rude type of ballad poetry and the subject-matter was mainly the wars and loves of heroes, miracles of saints and prophets, or some religious

teaching. Such was the poetry of Mokhdums Abul Hasan, and Muhammed Hashim, of Tatta, Abdurrahim of Giror, Shah Inayet Sufi and some others. This old *dohra* type of poetry continued up to the beginning of the 17th century. Then slowly came poetry arranged in longer stanzas, but still in the same old method, in which there was no regularity of feet or syllables or accents, but only a rough rhyming and a sort of ballad rhythm, as may be seen in the *Bayanul Arfin* of Makhdum Abdussamad Naorangpoto.

These were followed about the end of 18th century by the *Risalo* or the poetical works of Shah Abdullatif of Bhit. These were written in the old Sindhi ballad metre. The Shah gained full recognition as a great genius and his poetry has ever since been regarded as the model by the subsequent poets. His *Risalo* has taken a strong hold on the people of Sind of all classes and religions. He is a Sufi, a mystic poet-saint and his spiritual teachings are given in love songs and old love stories, in *baits* and *wais*, which have an interest all their own. Shah Abdullatif Bhitai may be considered the father of modern Sindhi poetry. He is the most prominent classical poet of Sind. His poetry has become entwined round the very life of the Sindhi.

"The poet is," says Thomas Carlyle, "a heroic figure belonging to all ages. Let nature send a hero-soul; in no age is it other than possible that he may be shaped a poet." This compliment is meant not for every one who takes up pen and ink and puts down some couplets or stanzas on paper, as many have done, and are still doing in Sind and elsewhere. But the words are only applicable to that wonderful individual, who seems to have sometimes among the villagers toiling in fields for their scanty earning and sometimes among the gipsies loitering through hills and valleys; now among the soldiers fighting for their fatherland, now among the learned doctors preaching sermons to congregations of the faithful and again among the merry band of love-stricken,

giddy-brained sensualists,—in fact, among all sorts and conditions of people, observing deeply the different phases of human nature and of the human mind, chanting as he flits from one type to the other those sweet strains that thrill the hearts of hearers. This individual—this original world-observing, "myriad-minded" individual—is the true poet. He thinks musically, he speaks musically, he acts musically. Nay his very silence is musical. The ancients were not far wrong when they made no difference between the poet and the prophet. Carlyle remarks, "Fundamentally, indeed they (the poet and the prophet) are still the same, in this most important respect especially, that they have penetrated both of them into the sacred mystery of the Universe; what Goethe calls 'the open secret'......that divine mystery, which lies everywhere in all beings, 'the Divine idea of the world, that which lies at the bottom of appearance', as Fichte styles it; of which all appearance, from the starry sky to the grass of the field, but especially the appearance of man and his work, is but the vesture, the embodiment, that renders it visible." This is exactly what the idea of the real Oriental Sufi.

Such a Sufi was Shah Abdullatif Bhitai, who was a descendant of the Prophet of Islam, and himself in every way a true saint worthy of his descent. He is full of intense transcendentalism and sacred glory. If he cannot be deified, he might certainly be canonized. A spiritual guide while living, a poet-saint, when dead, he still reigns over the hearts of millions through his grave, musical and mysterious strains.

Shah Abdullatif Bhitai used the old style of metre but introduced songs at the end of each section or sub-section of his *Risalo*. He was followed by some other Sufi poets, the most prominent of whom was Sachal Fakir of Daraz in the Khairpur State. He lived in the reign of the last Talpur rulers of Sind. He wrote poetry in Siraiki and in Persian as well, and

his Sindhi poetry mostly consists of *dohras* and *kafis* which are sung to this day like those of the Shah. He too was a Sufi and saint-poet and had many disciples, some of whom too were fairly good poets. Among these latter two may be particularly mentioned: Yusuf Fakir and Robit Fakir, as their poetry was somewhat different from that of others. They wrote *ślokas* in the Hindi *bhāṣā*, which were very much valued by Hindus, many of whom became their disciples. About the same time some Hindu poets also appeared and wrote Sufic poetry in the ballad metre, but in the Hindu style. These were Lalu Bhagat, Sami Menghraj and his disciple Bhai Chainrai, whose *ślokas* are well-known.

This kind of old poetry continued up to the end of the 18th century when Mir Karamali Khan Talpur, out of his friendship for the Shah of Persia, brought a number of Persian scholars and poets to Sind and Persian became the language of fashion in Sind. Sindhi poetry now took a different turn and attempts were made to compose Sindhi poetry after Persian models and in Persian metres. Sabetali Shah, who was successful in this new kind of poetry began to write religious poems, or *marasias* (elegies) in Sindhi. He also wrote *kasidas* and other varieties of verse on the Persian model. Not only Persian metres were used, but many Persian phrases, figures of speech and idioms were also introduced, which made the poetry much more varied and interesting. Ever since then, this kind of Persian-Sindhi poetry has been in vogue and many have imitated Sabetali Shah.

Khalifah Gul Muhammad of Hala wrote a whole *devan* of *ghazals*, like those of Hafiz, in different Persian metres in Sindhi, but has tried to bring in many pure Sindhi words, just as Shah Abdullatif had done in his *Risalo*. He was followed by many other writers and they also wrote *divans* like him, such as the *Divan Kasim*, *Divan Fazul* and *Divan Sangi*.

During all this time no prose of any importance appeared. It was only after the establishment in Sind of the British Government, that original prose works began to be written in Sindhi; though these were in the beginning only meant for boys learning in the newly opened vernacular schools. Some of these were translations from English and Urdu works. The writers were mostly some of the Educational officers, chiefly Diwan Udhoram Thanwardas, Diwan Kauramal and Diwan Kewalram. As education progressed and educational institutions increased in numbers numerous books were written on different subjects, for use in these schools.

But lately many novels and other works of light literature have appeared, and as the number of private printing presses has increased in every big city, a large number of works both in prose and in poetry are published every year.

The main difference between the present style and the old lies is one important point. The older works were written by Hindus in a language that was understandable by both the Hindus and the Mahomedans of Sind. Such was the language used by the Hindu authors mentioned above. But at present most of the Hindu writers (and these form the majority) show a general tendency to use pure Sanskrit words and phrases and to write on subjects of exclusively Hindu interests. Naturally therefore, the Mahomedans seldom read them. This has been the case even with the Educational Readers and other books. So great had this divergence grown that as a result of the resolutions of the Mahomedan Educational Conference objecting to these books, the Government had recently to order a revision of these books by a mixed committee of Hindus and Mahomedans and they are still going on with their work.

In conclusion, I shall quote a passage from the Sind Gazetteer written by Mr. E. H. Aitkin. I should, however, be excused for quoting it even though my own name is

mentioned in it and I cannot omit it.[1] Speaking about the present state of literature in Sind, he says—"The education of the country by British methods, has called forth a plentiful crop of literature of a different order. School-books and translations or adaptations of English works, of course, predominate, but some useful work has also been done in dressing in a Sindhi garb samples of good things from Sanskrit and Persian literature. Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg has been especially fertile in these departments and has also produced a large number of original works, while he has laid those who do not know Sindhi under obligation by a translation into English, of the *Chachnamah* and a history of Sind, which is a translation of selections from the *Tarikh Masumi* and the *Tuhfatulkiram*. The new education has also brought Hindus into the field, among whom Mr. Dayaram Gidumal, Mr. Lilaram Watanmal, Mr. Kauramal Chandanavi and many others have given their countrymen both translations and original compositions. To pass on to more ephemeral literature, there are now many newspapers in Sind, both English and Vernacular, some old and well established and some of mushroom growth."

[1] The modesty of the writer of this article has prevented further mention of his own great share in the revival of Sindhi literature in modern times. He has been (as all my Sindhi friends inform me) the greatest Sindhi writer of the present age and has done more than any other Sindhi living to revive the literature of his mother-tongue.—I. J. S. T.

PRESENT-DAY MONASTIC LIFE IN CEYLON

REV. R. SIDDHARTHA,

Lecturer in Pali and Sinhalese, University of Calcutta

The monastic system is the central institution in Buddhism, and in all countries where Buddhism is still a living religion, the monk is held in peculiar veneration by the lay people, however critical they may have been in these modern days. The number of Bhikkhus in Ceylon may be put down roughly at about 7,000, out of a Buddhist population of about 22,000,000, but the spiritual influence exercised by the former on the lay people is immeasurable, and when we remember that Buddhists form not less than three fifths of the entire population of the island, the high and honourable position occupied by these monks can be easily imagined.

The order of monks most influential in Ceylon to-day is of Siamese origin, and of comparatively recent introduction dating only from A.D. 1752; but Ceylon has never been without its monastic system for any considerable period since the introduction of Buddhism over twenty-two centuries ago. The Ceylonese monastic system has had a chequered career which I propose to describe as briefly as possible before coming to the subject more relevant to my purpose.

As is well-known, Ceylon was colonised 236 years before her conversion to Buddhism, by Vijaya, the Bengal Prince, and his followers, who arrived at the island the very year in which Buddha attained Nirvāṇa. Vijaya was not a Buddhist but a follower of the religion which we now call Hinduism. When Prince Vijaya and his seven hundred followers settled in Ceylon, they sent to the king of Madhurā,

in the Pāṇḍu kingdom in south India, for wives. That king not only gave his own daughter in marriage to Prince Vijaya, but sent other brides for his followers, having due regard for their respective caste and rank. He further sent over a large number of families belonging to eighteen different castes, artisans, horse-keepers, elephant-keepers and such others as might be required for the growth of a newly planted colony. The population of the island thus increased within a short time. A large part of the island was brought under cultivation. Later migrations from both southern and northern India were so rapid that within 250 years, from the time of Prince Vijaya, at the accession of "Devānampiya" Tissa, who was a contemporary of Aśoka, we find almost all parts of Ceylon except a small area in Malaya, the hilly region in the centre, thoroughly populated by this new race.

It is thus to be noted that Ceylon was peopled by emigrants from India, and that therefore its civilisation was purely Indian in character. Intermarriages between Ceylonese and Indians were frequent; and even a hundred years ago princes and nobles of Ceylon were proud to have marital connexion with Indian families: and Indians, on their side, also, never hesitated to give their daughters in marriage to them.

In proud recognition of their Indian origin, the people changed the very name of their island from Laṅkā to Siṁhala, showing their connexion with king Siṁhabāhu of Siṁhapura in Bengal, father of Prince Vijaya. And when some 236 years later they changed their religion, they did so out of their love for the old country. Their new religion, Buddhism, was the most flourishing religion of India at this period; and the Sinhalese became Buddhist without much hesitation only because they felt that it was the sovereign of their mother country who wanted them to be Buddhists, inasmuch as the son and the daughter of their sovereign had themselves come and preached and converted them to Buddhism. The new

religion and the new name they adopted strengthened rather than loosened their tie with India, and it is quite possible to conceive that if the Sinhalese had not become Buddhists, they might have lost, among other benefits, the intimate relation they had so long had with that country. Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon 236 years after its colonisation by Vijaya. Aśoka the Great, Emperor of India, was a friend of "Devānampiya" Tissa, king of Ceylon, and the former sent him, as the best present that he could give his friend, this great religion, through his son, Mahinda, who had become a Bhikkhu himself. Indeed, Ceylon gained much by accepting the new gospel. The "Golden Laṅkā" of which we read in the pages of history owed much of her brilliance and lustre to the high moral doctrine of Buddha which made the people good in every respect. All the literary wealth that the Sinhalese possess, all the historic buildings that attract thousands of pilgrims, are some of the tangible gifts they obtained by becoming Buddhists. The spiritual gain was still higher and they have been enjoying it still for more than two thousand years.

It is not claiming too much for Buddhist Bhikkhus to say that all this benefit accrued from them. The monastic system arose immediately on the introduction of Buddhism, and the first monastery in Ceylon was the Nivatta Cetiya in Anurādhapura which was built by King Tissa for the royal missionary, Mahinda, and his companions in 236 B. E. (i e., 308 B. C.) and its magnificent ruins are still visible. In a short time, the Sinhalese began to enter the order and numerous monasteries sprang up. We read in history that our kings spent a great portion of their wealth in building monasteries, the ruins of which we still see scattered all over the country. In the north at Anurādhapura and its suburbs alone there are still visible the ruins of innumerable monasteries, of which Nivatta Citiya, Dūrasaṅkara Vihāra, Abhayagiri Vihāra, Jetavana Vihāra, Laṅkārāma Vihāra, Isurumuni

Vihāra, Vessagiri Vihāra, Cetiyagiri Vihāra (now called Mihintale) and Lohapāsāda are noteworthy. It was in the Ganthākara Parivena of Dūrasaṅkarā Vihāra that the famous Buddhaghosa Thera wrote his *Aṭṭhakathās* (commentaries). Some of these were very vast in size. Fa-Hian, the well-known Chinese pilgrim, who visited Ceylon about the beginning of the 5th century A.D. found in some monasteries at Anurādhapura two or three thousands Bikkhus. The Lohapāsāda mentioned above was built by king "Duṭṭha" Gāmani Abhaya (B. C. 161-137). It was a building of nine stories having one thousand rooms. It was furnished with costly furniture and decorated with jewels. Fa-Hian who saw it personally, speaks very highly of its grandeur and beauty. It is said that the king spent about 300,000,000 gold coins over the building. Some 1600 stone pillars which once supported the building are all that stand to-day as sad memorials of its vanished glory. The next great builder of *vihāras* was Parākramabāhu the Great (1164-1197) of Polonnaruwa (formerly called Pulatthipura). His capital was full of monasteries. Among them the Satmahalpahaya, Jetavanārāma, and Thupārāma are the most celebrated. Parākramabāhu built *vihāras* in his city naming them after those in which Buddha himself had lived. In his time there were many learned Bhikkhus of whom Kassapa Mahāthera of Udumbaragiri Vihāra and Sāriputta Thera were the most famous. Kassapa Mahāthera was the teacher of almost all the learned Bhikkhus of the island, and Sāriputta Thera was a great author. His *ṭīkās* (sub-commentaries) on Samantapāsādikā and on Manorathapūraṇī show how great a scholar he was. His knowledge of Sanskrit is shown in his great work on Candragomin's Grammar. It should be noted here that the monastic system founded by Mahinda Thera did not continue up to the time of Parākramabāhu the Great. By the time of king Mahā Vijayabāhu (A. D. 1065-1120) the older system had degenerated and that pious king brought

Bhikkhus from Ramanna Desa in Burma, and established a new "rule" which was in existence at the time of Parākramabāhu the Great. This new system, however, was not very different from the old one, because in Burma as in Ceylon, the monks were *theriya* (i. e., belonging to the Theravāda School of monks). Within a hundred and fifty years of its introduction it also began to show signs of corruption, and king Parākramabāhu II (A.D. 1250-1285) sent for Bhikkhus to the Chola kingdom and reformed the system. But this reformed scheme, too, did not have a longer career than three hundred years. Rājasiṁha I (A. D. 1581-1592) was greatly inimical to Bhikkhus as they had not approved of his patricide. He massacred them, and destroyed books, libraries and everything belonging to Buddhism. This cruel king's wrath did not fall only upon the religion. Even arts and sciences did not escape his destructive hand. Thus, this cruel king destroyed all that the Sinhalese had accumulated as their treasure for over eighteen centuries—their religion, sciences, literature, philosophy, and arts. Darkness came over the land such as it had never experienced before. The appearance of the Portuguese in the island about this time was another calamity. It made difficult to repair what had been lost. The Sinhalese had to fight a long time with these new invaders to maintain their rights in their native land, and this fighting was remarkably bloody and cruel. However, some time after, a national hero appeared who established peace and order in the country to a great extent. This was Rājasiṁha II (A. D. 1634-1684). He defeated the Portuguese and brought about peace that lasted for a long time even after his death. His son, Vimaladharmasūrya (A. D. 1684-1706), was a very good monarch. He loved peace, and lived amicably with the Dutch who had followed in the wake of the Portuguese and were then in possession of the maritime districts of the island. This king with the intention of re-establishing Buddhism brought Bhikkhus from the

Rakkhanga Desa (Arakan) and ordained about 33 Sinhalese Bhikkhus. But this monastic system did not last longer than one generation.

Then, in the time of Kīrti Srī Rājasiṁha (A.D. 1747-1780), a very pious sage known as Velivita Pindapatika Saranankara urged the king to get Bhikkhus from Siam and to establish monastaries in Ceylon. This king sent ambassadors to the king of Siam and brought over Bhikkhus from that country in A. D. 1752, and established Buddhism and monasteries once again. Kīrti Srī Rājasiṁha with the advice of the most pious Thera, Saranankara, did every thing for the improvement and upkeep of the monasteries. This monastic system of Siamese origin is the one prevailing in Ceylon at the present day.

Other sects existing to-day are of minor importance. Of about 7,000 Bhikkhus living in Ceylon nearly two-thirds belong to the Siamese sect, the remaining one-third being divided between the Amarapura sect residing chiefly in the western maritime districts, and the Ramanna sect recently introduced from Ramanna Desa in Burma. The Amarapura sect was founded as a protest against the law passed by king Kīrti Srī Rājasiṁha, prohibiting the admission of all low caste men (lower than Vaiśyas) into the monastic order he had introduced from Siam. A long effort was made by the people belonging to these castes to get the law abolished, but it failed, and they sent some of their men to Burma for ordination, and when they returned, the Amarapura sect was established (A. D. 1801).

The Ramanna sect came into existence about 70 years ago, and is, like the former, of Burmese origin, and mainly confined to the western maritime tracts, though both, however, are now making some progress in the inland districts. These two sects differ from the Siamese only as regards the admission of lower castes into the monastic order. In all other essentials they agree. The life of a Bhikkhu in Ceylon is guided by the laws laid down in the Ancient Scripture and is of an

invariable character, irrespective of the sect to which he belongs. And it is the daily life of a Buddhist Bhikkhu in Ceylon to-day that I propose to describe in this paper; but some thing must be said about the management of temples and their property before I come to it.

When the minister of Srī Vikramarājasiṁha, the last king of Ceylon deposed him and handed over the country to the British in A. D. 1815, one of the twelve conditions on which the transfer was made, was that the new rulers should protect the religion of the chiefs and of the people of the Kandyan kingdom. "The religion of Boodhoo, professed by the chiefs and inhabitants of these provinces, is declared inviolable; and its rights, ministers and places of worship, are to be maintained and protected": this pledge willingly given by the British at that time has ever since been faithfully kept by them. For several years the religious institutions were directly controlled by them. They appointed the Chief High Priest and his subordinates and also officers to look after the management of the temporalities. The actual disbursement of money was left in the hands of the officers appointed; a kind of non-interfering supervision was all that was exercised by the Government. In 1847 the Government ceased to have direct control over the appoinment of High Priests and other affairs, and handed over all such rights to the Chief High Priest of Kandy and to the Kandyan Chiefs. But this does not mean that Government have ceased to take all interest in the management of the temples. Only about sixteen years ago a law was passed for the protection of temple-lands and district committees were formed. And in 1920 the Government, finding that some of these committees were not working well, appointed a Commissioner at the head of the committees. The two Burmese sects cannot claim, according to the Kandyan convention of 1815, that paternal supervision by the Government which is enjoyed by the Siamese sect.

The affairs of the Siamese sect, specially regarding property belonging to the temples, are guided by the Laws of the Scripture, and by the regulations passed by the Sinhalese kings and also by the customary law that has come down from very early times. All the ancient temples in the island belong to the Siamese sect, as it is the one established and maintained by the kings of the land. The Burmese sects, established as they were by private individuals, have no claim to any of them. Even such temples as Kalyani Vihara, Totagamu Vihara, Tissamaharama, etc., which in the days of the Sinhalese kings were in what was then called "the British Territory," where the Amarapura sect had its seat, were in the possession of the Bhikkhus of the Siamese sect even when their king was fighting with the British. The monks who lived in the temples which were in "the British Territory," were, no doubt, British subjects politically speaking, but they owed allegiance to the *Māhā Nāyaka Thera* (the Chief High Priest) of Kandy, who was appointed by the Sinhalese king. But the British rulers never interfered with these monks and never thought of giving those temples to the Bhikkhus of the Amarapura sect, who were their subjects and who owed no such suspicious allegiance. The Amarapura and Ramanna sects owed only such temples as were built and offered to them by their own followers. Some of the temples which belong to the Siamese sect are very rich, having an annual income of Rupees 50,000 to 1,00,000. Though the Bhikkhus are the absolute owners of this property they cannot undertake management as they are strictly prohibited to do so by the Laws of the *Vinaya*. Therefore, in the days of the Sinhalese kings, the king himself acted as the head manager of these temporalities. He appointed officers to collect the revenue and to spend them for the comfort of the Bhikkhus and for the upkeep of the temples. A great chief of his realm was appointed under the title of *Diyavadana Nilame* to look after the Great Tooth Relic Temple at Kandy on behalf of

the king and to manage the property belonging to that temple. *Devālayas*, which are really Hindu temples, held sacred by the Buddhists, were placed under chiefs who were called *Basnayaka Nilames*. To manage small estates officers known as *Vidanes* were appointed.

The *Diyavadana Nilame* and the *Basnayaka Nilames* were invested with much power; they had only to obey the king and the High Priest. They could appoint all the assistants and the menial officers and had the right to punish them if they did any wrong. These offices were not heriditary but they were always given to those who belonged to the chiefs' families. The *Vidanes* were generally selected from the families of the gentlefolk, but any body who was able to perform the duties was selected irrespective of caste. The chiefs of Kandy are all high caste, being of Kṣatriya origin. There are also some who are of Brahmanic origin.

None of these officers were paid, but they were given lands to enjoy (sometimes even without any tax) for the services they rendered. The king never imposed any tax on the temple property. A special officer called *Sangakkara Maha Lekama* was appointed to look after the comforts of the Bhikkhus of the Royal Temples at Kandy. He was also the minister-in-charge of the religious affairs in the country. The landed property always increased by the offerings that kings made from time to time, and some temples had 50,000 to 60,000 acres and some even 80,000. But the "Waste Land Ordinations" recently passed by the Government were applied to these lands and a greater portion of them was declared to be Crown Lands.

The king of the country appointed the *Mahā Nāyaka Thera* (the Chief High Priest), the *Anunāyaka Thera* (the Assistant Chief High Priest), and the *Nāyaka Theras* (the High Priests).

The *Mahā Nāyaka Thera* was the head of the Bhikkhus and had absolute control over them. His consent was

necessary for ordaining a new Bhikkhu, and he could punish any Bhikkhu by disrobing him. All cases which were very important were heard and decided by him, and the king generally took his consent before making any regulation regarding religion. He had free entrance to the king's palace and therefore was the chief instrument of the people in laying before the king their grievances. The *Mahā Nāyaka Thera* was second to none in the island so far as matters of religion or of Bhikkhus were concerned, and his voice in such matters was superior to the king's.

The *Anunāyaka Thera* was the personal assistant of the *Mahā Nāyaka* and generally the successor.

The *Nāyaka Theras* were the heads of the provinces or districts or sometimes of the temples which were very important.

The *Mahā Nāyaka Thera* had a council of which all the Bhikkhus of the royal temple at Kandy were members. But this council was only a consulting body. All the Bhikkhus in the island had to take their ordination in the Royal Temple at Kandy, where the monks who had come from Siam had first ordained the Sinhalese Bhikkhus.

It should be noted here that King Kīrti Srī Rājasiṁha who reformed Buddhism through the Siamese monks, established two *Vihāras* in Kandy, his capital, and arranged for ordination in both the places. Both are existing to-day.

Sometimes the king would appoint a *Saṅgharāja Thera* (the king of the Sangha or the Bhikkhus) with kingly power in matter of religion, but we find mention of only a few of them in our history. The last *Saṅgharāja Thera* was the above-mentioned Saranankara Maha Thera who lived in the time of Kīrti Srī Rajasiṁha.

The changes that took place under the British rule were that the rulers ceased to appoint the High Priests and the managing chiefs of the temples; the rights and control of the religion so long exercised by the Government were vested in

the Chief High Priest of Kandy and on the Kandyan Chiefs. The Chief High Priest was to be elected by the council of Bhikkhus of the Royal Temple at Kandy and by the Kandyan Chiefs, the *Anunāyaka Theras* and the *Nāyaka Theras* were to be appointed by the Chief High Priest in council; the number of the members of this council was reduced to twenty and they were to be selected by the Chief High Priest from among the Bhikkhus of the Royal Temple at Kandy. The high priests for great temples, again, are to be appointed by the Chief High Priest in council, and sometimes, as in the case of the High Priest of the Adam's Peak, with the consent of the Bhikkhus of the province in which the temple stood, and also in consultation with Government. The *Diyāvadāna Nilame* of the Tooth Relic Temple, and the *Basnayaka Nilames* of *devālapas* are now to be elected by the Kandyan Chiefs and by the two Chief High Priests of the Royal Temples at Kandy. The *Vidanes* are to be appointed by the High Priest in Charge of the temple. The elections thus made are recognised by Government, and in some cases the Government Agent hands over the Documents to the persons thus elected.

The persons in charge of the Tooth Relic Temple are the two Chief High Priests and the *Diyavodana Nilames.* And the *devālayas* are in charge of the *Basnayaka Nilames* duly selected. These persons were, for a long time, responsible to none and the management of temple property was far from being efficient and above suspicion. A law was, however, recently passed for the protection of temple lands and district committees were formed to which all the above officers are now responsible.

These committees are again made responsible to an officer recently appointed under the title of 'the Commissioner of the Buddhist Temporalities'.

It is to be noted here that among all the district committees the one in Kandy is the most important as it has under its control the richest temples and *Devālayas* in the island.

Now that an account of the growth of monasteries has been given, it will be not without interest to enquire what the monastery-life is like. This can be best done by following the life of a particular Bhikkhu in a particular temple and I should like to give a short description of my own life and my own experiences.

My *Pabbajjācariya* (the preceptor who admits pupils into the order), just three months after he had admitted me as a Samanera (novice), sent me to my *Uddesācariya*, or the teacher who teaches Buddhism and other necessary things. This latter was a *Nāyaka Thera*, a high priest in the Colombo district. He was also my Upajjhāya (Sanskrit Upādhyāya, one who trains the pupils in good manners and etiquette and corrects all weak points in the character of the pupil).

I was then only eleven years old and I lived under him a little more than four years, after which period I was sent up to the Vidyodaya College, Colombo. A description of my life under the *Thera* will, I think, give the reader some idea of what the present monastery life in Ceylon is like. When I went to him, there were under him some other novices who had been sent to him by their respective *Gurus* for their training. Two of them were pupils of the Chief High Priest of Ceylon.

We all were to follow the rules of the *Dinacariya* strictly. This small book is written both in Pali and in Sinhalese. As a custom, *Dinacariya*, *Sekhiya*, *Samanera Sikkha*, *Satara Kamatahan*, *Pilikul Bhavanā*, *Pasvikum* and *Paritta Suttas* are to be got by heart before one can be admitted to the noviciate. Among these, *Dinacariya* is a book in which a day's duties of a novice are given. *Sekhiya* is a book in which are the rules of etiquette to be observed in general behaviour and when one is in a dining hall or out in a village. *Samanera Sikkha* or *Herana Sika* contains all high moral laws that are to be observed by a novice. *Satara Kamatahan* (or *Cattāri Kammaṭṭhānāni*) is a

collection of verses which one has to repeat morning and evening. They deal with *Buddhānussati*, contemplation of the Buddha; *Mettā*, universal love; *Asubhabhāvanā*, invalidity of our body; *Maranassati*, contemplation of death. *Pilikul Bhavanā* is a booklet treating of the composition of the body and seeking to prove the worthlessness of the body viewed from a spiritual standpoint. *Pasvikum* (*Paccavekkhana*) are the formulae that we should repeat when we put on a cloth, or take food, or medicine or lie down on a bed, or sit on a seat. The purport of these formulae is that we use all these things not for luxury but for the maintenance of our body only in order to keep it fit to perform holy duties. *Parittas* are such *sutras*. as are to be repeated as protective formulae.

When we are a little more advanced we are to get by heart the *Dhammapada*, *Satipaṭṭhānasutta* and other similar verses as moral and spiritual lessons. As a custom no illiterate person is admitted to the order of the novice. If such a person be willing to become a *Sāmanera*, he must be, first of all, taught to read and write and then made to get by heart the verses and formulae mentioned above. It is only then that he is fit to be admitted as a *Sāmanera*. First of all my *Uddesācariya* asked me to get by heart a booklet containing Pali declension and conjugation and when I finished it I was given the *Bālāvatāra*, an elementary Grammar in Pali, to get by heart also. After I had done a part of it the Pali *Nighandu* (Pali lexicon in 1203 verses) was given, and some time after the *Dhātumañjusā*, the book dealing with roots of Pali words in verse. In the mean time the commentary on *Dhammapada* was taught as part of a course in the language and when I finished about a half of it the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* was begun By this time *Bālāvatāra* was fully learnt by rote and I began learning its meaning. The usual way of teaching *Bālāvatāra* is to teach only the meaning of the *vrittis* first and then the meaning of the *sutras*, and in the

third time to show the formation of the terms on a black-board and last of all to make a critical study. In reading the book critically we have to read different *tikas*, *ganthipadas* and translations. We are also taught to write a good hand and recite verses and prose with proper intonation.

Our education was, as can be seen, so far elementary and merely a preliminary to higher studies.

An account of our early life will, I hope, prove more interesting. We were to get up at four o'clock in the morning; if we failed to do so, the *Upajjhāya* would awake us. We were to sleep on mats spread on the ground; our bedding consisted of a single sheet and a pillow. We could not use chairs or tables which are for the exclusive use of the elderly Bhikkhus. We had to keep our bed clothes neat and clean and had to wash them ourselves. As soon as we got up in the morning, we had to get hot and cold water ready for the Guru and other elderly Bhikkhus. In cleansing our teeth we were not allowed to use charcoal but had to use roots of plants like the *Karanja* cut into pieces about four inches in length. One end of it is pointed and the other is shaped like a brush. This is called *dantakatha*. Morning duties over, we sat together and recited *satrakumvtahan* and *Atita Parvikum* , and one *sutra* from the *parittas*. Then we began reciting from memory what we had learnt by heart—usually passages from *Bālāvatāra* or some other book. When it was dawn, some of us went to the *vihara*, where some swept the inner apartment, some threw away faded flowers and made all the court-yard clean. Some of them went to pluck flowers to offer to the Buddha. Some of us swept and cleaned the residential quarters and prepared seats for the elderly Bhikkhus to sit on. Elderly Bhikkhus including the *Upajjhāya* were not idle all this time, they too, swept some court-yards along with us. When this was finished and the bell was rung, the elderly Bhikkhus and ourselves went to the *vihara* (i.e., the shrine room) and worshipped the Buddha by offering

flowers. All of us then came back to the temple or the residential quarters and there, after the *Upajjhāya* had taken his seat, we all bowed down before him and asked his pardon for all the wrongs that we might have committed consciously or unconsciously. He readily pardoned us and asked for our pardon in return for any wrong he might have done even unintentionally. In doing this the elderly Bhikkhus took the lead and then the novices followed. Then all the Bhikkhus and *Samanerıs* bowed down to their elders and asked their pardon. In Buddhist monasteries elders are entitled to receive the respectful salutations of the younger ones. And those that are younger receive only the love and kindness from the elders. In saluting elders and in asking their pardon a special formula is to be used. Salutation over, when the bell was rung again we went to the dining hall (*dhanasala* or *bhojanasala*) where some light refreshments such as *yāgu* (rice gruel) would be ready. This refreshment was sometimes prepared by the *Kappiyakārakas*[1]; sometimes it was brought by the *Dayakas* of the surrounding villages. Sometimes, again the villagers brought us confectionery but generally we took very light things in the morning, or took nothing at all. To take *yāgu* or rice gruel in the morning in monasteries is so well known a custom in Ceylon that "to take *yāgu*" in common talk means to live in a monastery.

We then went to the *Upajjhāya* one by one with our books and recited before him with hands folded what we had got by heart on the previous day. If he found that we had learnt our lessons well he would give us a new lesson; if not, he would ask us to prepare the old lesson thoroughly and come next day. We would then go to secluded places and

[1] *Kappiyakārakas* are those lay boys who live in monasteries, study and serve the Bhikkhus. Generally, any layman, young or old, who lives in a monastery and serves the Bhikkhus is called the *Kappiyakāraka*. As the Bhikkhus or even the *Sāmaneras* are not allowed to do certain duties the assistance of the *Kappiyakārakas* is very much needed. They also help *Sāmaneras* in their work.

occupy ourselves with our tasks till it was time to go on begging. Then we came back to the temple, and washed our bowls and those of our elderly Bhikkhus and then dressing up well we all went to the village to beg our food. We generally went in different directions and the very young among us were accompanied by a *Kappiyakāraka* or a boy-attendant.

We returned from the village after about an hour and placed our begging bowls in proper places. And then we hung out our robes and those of our elderly Bhikkhus in the sun for they were wet with perspiration, and after they were aried and dry we folded them up and placed them in proper places. Some of us then went to the dining room to make everything ready and some went to bathe. Before 11 o'clock a bell was rung and we all gathered in the dining hall and sat on mats with our begging bowls on our laps and began partaking of our food. Before this we set apart a portion of our food to offer to Buddha and the *Upajjhāya* and other elderly Bhikkhus. And just before we began eating we exchanged with one another what we had separately got—curries, sweetmeats and any other delicacies there might be. In the dining hall the *Upajjhāya* and other elderly Bhikkhus sat together on the same mat, and we, novices, sat together on a separate one. Sometimes we got invitations from the village and on such days we did not go a-begging. Before taking meals we have to repeat some formulae which have the meaning that we do not take the meal to make our bodies beautiful and fat, nor is it our intention to lead a happy and jolly life, our object is only to sustain this body so that we could perform our holy duties. While taking meals we had to observe several rules. We could not make any noise by the smacking of lips, or speak while food was in the mouth. We were not to stuff in big morsels, or lick either the finger or the lips, or speak loudly, or ask for anything which was not offered to us. We were, further,

not to look about while eating, nor expect to have any tasty thing served to us twice, nor look at others' bowls with a jealous eye. Neither were we to put all the fingers into the mouth; nor put out the tongue to receive the morsels, nor touch the water cup with the dirty hand. We had to finish our meals before mid-day as *Vikāla Bhojana*, or taking food after mid-day is strictly prohibited. We then washed our own bowls and those of the *Upajjhāya* and the other elderly Bhikkhus and cleansed these by scouring and laying them out to dry in the sun. Next we swept and cleansed the dining hall. The elderly Bhikkhus then went to take rest while we went to secluded places to practise hand-writing. After about an hour, when we found the *Upajjhāya* had come out from his rest, we all went with our books to study. Some of us went to the *Upajjhāya*, others to other elderly Bhikkhus as had been previously arranged. We read two or three hours and if there was still time left, we again went to our secluded places to study or get by heart our lessons. This we would continue till evening when we would again sweep the temple and the court-yards. After this was finished all of us went to bathe. After bath we first lit the lamps of the shrine room (*vihāra*) and also of the residential quarters of the Temple. In the *vihāra* we spent some time in worshipping the Buddha and repeating *Paritta* etc. And then, again bowing down to the Guru and the elderly Bhikkhus and as in the morning we asked their pardon. The Guru and the other elderly Bhikkhus replied and then if they wished to teach us again they called us to them. Otherwise we went to some place and sat together and repeated what we had learnt by heart. This we did for two or three hours while our Guru and other elderly Bhikkhus spent the time in reading or talking together or mostly in talking with the *Dayakas* (or the parishioners) who generally came to the monastery to see the Bhikkhus after their day's work. While we recited our lessons the Guru listened to us

to find out whether we did it well, and if he detected any mistake he would correct it. After we had finished our lessons, we prepared beds for the Guru and other elderly Bhikkhus and got hot and cold water ready for them and informed them when all was ready. They then washed their feet and faces and went to their bed-rooms. There they sometimes read for a little while longer or after meditation went to sleep. We, too, went to bed, having washed our hands and feet and faces, having placed every thing in its proper place and after putting out all lamps except one or two which burned all through the night. We were extremely particular about getting up early because it was regarded by our Guru as very wrong to sleep after four o'clock. We got up, therefore, as early as possible and resumed our duties as before.

Beside performing these regular duties we had to do many other things as occasion arose. When a Bhikkhu came as a guest, we had to serve him properly. Whoever of us saw a guest approaching had to go forward and take from his hands his umbrella and fan, conduct him to the temple and give him a seat. We then bowed down before him and one of us fanned him, while another prepared some drink for him, and yet another brought water to wash his feet and face. As regards drinks the Bhikkhus take only the juice of some fruits (or tea or coffee without milk), after mid-day. Before noon they can take anything except liquor. We would next take the upper garment of our guest and put it out in the sun to dry. Then if the Guru had not yet seen him we would inform him about his arrival. If we learned that he was going away soon we handed back to him his umbrella, fan and robe and when he had dressed himself and got ready, if he was elder than the Guru, the Guru would bow down and ask leave of him, and also ask his pardon if any thing was done even unconsciously. But if he was younger than the Guru he would do the same. And then we all would go to him and bow down, ask his pardon and conduct him up to the gate.

But if he showed any intention of spending the night in our monastery we would prepare a bed for him and show him where the water-closet was and do for him every thing that we did for other Bhikkhus in our monstery. As long as he would be with us we would serve him and when he was leaving us we would do everything as mentioned above. It was our duty to keep everything neat and clean. We washed our utensils and washed and dyed our robes and those of our Guru and other elderly Bhikkus. To colour our robes we prepared a a kind of dye out of jackwood by cutting it into small pieces and boiling them. If the Guru was going out of the monastery for some days he would inform us of it beforehand and we prepared everything that was needed. On the eve of his departure we would all appear before him and bow down. He would then tell what we should do till his return. Meanwhile the eldest among the Bhikkhus would act as our *Upādhyāya* and we all would obey him as such.

If the Guru was ill we nursed him. If one of us became ill the Guru would nurse him through other novices. The affection existing between the *Upajjhāya* and *Antevāsikas* (the disciples) is clearly visible only in the time of illness. The relation between the *Upajjhāya* and the *Antevāsikas* is just like that of a father to sons. And the relation of the novices to one another is like that existing between sons of one father.

On *Uposatha* days, i. e., days which are set apart for the special religious duties and which occur twice in a month on the new moon and the full moon day, our routine was quite different. These being the days when people come to the monastery to perform religious ceremonies we had to attend on them in their performance of the ceremonial rites and make arrangements in the *dharmaśālā* for the preaching. Again, it is on these days that Bhikkhus of different monsteries gather together to perform *uposatha kamma*.[1] We had to attend them

[1] *Uposathakamma* is the ceremony in which the Bhikkhus gather and recite all the laws that were passed by the Buddha for the guidance of the Bhikkhus.

and also had to arrange the *uposathâgāra.*[1] We did not read at all on such days. It should be mentioned here that we did all duties by turns. At nightfall, when all the performances were over, the lay-devotees, both male and female, gathered together in the *dharmasālā* and our Guru or some other Bhikkhu deputed by him preached a sermon till late at night, and on some occasions even till the next morning. We too went and listened to this sermon from a place specially reserved. But if the hall was so full that no seat could be reserved, we would listen to it either from the temple or from the *uposathāgāra.* If there were a novice so advanced as to be able to preach, sometimes he would be requested by the Guru to address the gathering. Among the 24 *uposatha* days that we ordinarily have in a year the *Vesaka*, the *Asalha*, and the *Assayuja Pubbakattika uposathas* are days for high celebration, these being the thrice-sacred days connected with Buddha's birth, His attaining Buddhahood and His *Parinibbana.* And the second being the day on which the Buddha preached His *Dharma* first is also the day on which the Bhikkhus begin to o serve the *Vassāvā a* (the vow to live in one place during the rainy season). The third is the day on which the *Vassāvāsa* ends. Among the remaining, the *Jeṭṭha-uposatha*, *Sāvana-uposatha*, *Aparakattika* or *Māgasīra-uposatha* and *Phussa-uposatha* are also days for comparatively big celebrations.

So far I have spoken of the life of a novice, though incidentally the life an elderly Bhikkhu has also been described. But let me give in short a separate account of a monk's life also. I shall choose a concrete instance and narrate the life of the world-famous Srī Sumaṅgala Nāyaka Thera, Principal of the Vidyodaya College, Colombo, who was an ideal of the Bhikkhus.

When I was under him he was about eighty but he was

[1] *Uposathâgāra* is the house in which *uposathakamma* is performed.

very active and could attend to his duties very well. His daily routine was as described below.

He got up every day at about four in the morning and spent about an hour in meditating and repeating such formulae as are to be repeated in the morning. And then he would often call some of his advanced pupils and explain to him some points of the *Dharma* and *Vinaya*, which he thought, were difficult and also important. He would next finish his morning ablution and then go to the shrine-room where he would worship the Buddha and perform other religious duties. After that he would take some light refreshment, generally milk or *conji*, and then begin reading. At eight he would go to his class and teach up to ten when he would come to his residential quarters and read letters and newspapers. At eleven when he was informed that his breakfast was ready he would go and partake of it. After that he would take rest for about half an hour and then he would begin reading again or reply to important letters. Class work would follow and would be continued up to in the evening, when, coming to his residence he would spend about an hour in receiving visitors or reading and writing letters. He would then go to the shrine-room again and worship the Buddha and then join the Bhikkhus in reciting *Paritta*. Coming back to his residence he would call other elderly Bhikkhus and speak about only important matters for about an hour or so. Then again he would begin reading or writing and this he would continue uptil midnight. Sometimes he would sit up even to one or two in the morning; but he was sure to get up at four to begin his next day.

Thus the lives of the Bhikkhus are spent in teaching, studying and performing religious duties. Not only is Buddhism and the Pali language taught in the monasteries but also Sanskrit language and literature and Sinhalese. Almost all the Bhikkhus in the island, therefore, who are counted as learned, are well versed in Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese; and all the

three languages with their literature are taught in the *Parivenas* or indigenous Colleges for teaching Oriental languages. In fact the very existence of these various literatures in this island till the present time is due to this class of men who have from very early times preserved and improved them in spite of very great troubles. On some occasion when the country was devastated by the foreign invaders these Bhikkhus carried books into the forests and kept them in caves or even buried them underground in iron or stone cases. Even at the time of Rājasiṃha I, they tried their best to save as many books as they could. But the cruel king sent officers to seek books in every nook and corner of the land and destroyed all that he could lay his hands upon. The present revival of Buddhism and spread of knowledge is due to the exertions of the most honoured Saranaṅkara Mahā Svāmi and King Kīrti Srī Rājasiṃha.

This love of study of the Bhikkhus is due to the fact that it is enjoined by the Buddha that the business of a Bhikkhu's life should be either to learn and preach Buddhism to others, or to practise meditation if they cannot engage themselves in missionary work. These two classes of Bhikkhus are called *Ganthadhura* and *Vipassanā dhura.* Both will lead to the *Nibbāṇa.* This injunction of the Buddha is respected by the Bhikkhus universally and from the very earliest times they follow it with great zeal.

This is the type of monastery life that exists to-day in Ceylon. The Bhikkhus spend a life of celibacy, they eat only once a day, they put on yellow robes which are made of bits of cloth sewn together, they use sandals which protect only the soles of the feet. Their life is very simple and pure, they never use money or transact any kind of business with money. They get everything necessary for their sustenance from the people who respect them as their spiritual leaders. Even the property given to the monasteries by the ancient kings is managed by the laymen who are to

collect the income and spend it for the maintenance of the monastery. The Bhikkhus generally lead a secluded life in their monasteries, which are generally situated in lonely places far away from even the village suburbs. The Bhikkhus are both spiritual and temporal advisers of the Buddhist lay community. Though the Bhikkhus depend upon the laity for the necessaries of their life, they are never a burden upon them, as contribution towards their maintenance is not compulsory. Anything the laity give to the Bhikkhus is given out of their own free will and a giver of gift is in no way better cared for by the Bhikkhus than those who give nothing. Both are equal in their eyes. Offerings given to the Bhikkhus are not regarded as presents to themselves, but as gifts to the *Sangha* or to the *Buddhasāsana*. The Bhikkhus, moreover, never ask for anything from the laity. They can, of course, tell their needs to their lay relatives and those who have expressed their willingness to help them. Even when they go a-begging they simply stand at the door of the lay men and if any thing is given they take it, but if not, after waiting about two or three minutes, they proceed calmly to another house. They do not even utter a word to let the inmates know they are standing at the door. If any *Dāyaka* requests a Bhikkhu to inform him whenever he wants anything, a Bhikkhu may let him know when he is badly in need of something, but that too he would do after considering whether the man is in a position to give him what he requires. The laity have the greatest veneration for the Bhikkhu. They bow down to him and never expect any salute in return ; the Bhikkhu only blesses them when they salute him. The laity never sit on a chair or any other high seat before a Bhikkhu. During native rule even the kings and the chiefs would sit on mats spread on the ground. Even to the present day these customs are observed by the laity. The laity, except the *Kappiyākārakas*, never eat anything from a monastery. They regard it as a great sin to use any

thing that belongs to the monastery. They enter the monastery with veneration. Some even fear to spit within the monastery grounds. They even fear to drink water from the monastery well. Though Buddhism has lost state help since the advent of the British, it is still flourishing with great vigour in Ceylon. Western education has changed the habit of the people to a great extent and they have become Europeanized in their life. Still the position of the Bhikkhus is the same. Many are to-day of opinion that if the Bhikkhus are educated in English they would lose their simplicity and become degenerated, but some also think that if the Bhikkhus learn English they would do much good to the world by preaching the *Dharma* to those who as yet do not know it. Recently the Government has instituted some classes in the Vidyodaya College to teach English to the young Bhikkhus and the *Sāmaneras*.

It is hoped that these young Bhikkhus, when they learn English and acquire the power to express their ideas to the people of other countries, they will be able to do much good by making more generally accessible the knowledge which is concealed in Pali and which is only known to the Bhikkhus.

MAHÂYĀNA IN THE MAKING

B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Lit. (Lond.),

Lecturer in Pâli, University of Calcutta

In this paper I set myself to examine three among the latest Pâli Canonical books in order to set forth the germs of certain Buddhist ideas that were afterwards incorporated and developed into the Mahāyāna system of faith, of which the *raison d'être* is what is known as the Doctrine of Trikāya.[1] The books concerned are: (1) the Buddhavaṁsa, (2) the Cariyāpiṭaka, and (3) the Apadāna. Though it has been noticed by previous scholars, such as Professor Rhys Davids [2] and Dr. Winternitz,[3] that the germs spoken of, can be traced in such texts as the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka, I have reasons to think that the attempt herein made is the first of its kind, for none of the previous scholars has seriously endeavoured to bring out the logical inter-connection of the three texts and their teachings, taken together.

I. *Preliminary Observations.*—Until the Canonical Jātaka Book, which is a collection of 500 Buddhist Birth-stories[4] in the shape of narrative ballads or dialogues in verse (ākhyānas, upākhyānas), is published, it is difficult to say if it contains any account of Gautama Buddha's present life. But judging from the fact that the Mahāpadāna Discourse in

[1] Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki was the first to emphasize this view in his *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 21. See his able exposition of the Trikāya-Doctrine ibid, pp. 256 f.

[2] *Buddhist India*, pp. 176-177.

[3] See Nariman's translation of Winternitz's views on Buddhist Literature in *A Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism*

[4] This is a surmise from the mention of 500 Birth-stories in the *Culla-Niddesa* (P. T. S.), p. 80.

Dīgha II, which contains an account of Gautama's present life along with that of the present lives of six previous Buddhas, is mentioned as a Jātaka in the Culla-Niddesa,[1] and also that the Niddesa scheme of Buddha's life embraces the stories of the present and of the past,[2] I am led to presume that the Canonical Jātaka Book also contains some account of his present existence. This conjecture gains in significance when it is found that the Barhut carvings, which presuppose, a running prose commentary on the Jātaka Book,[3] have more fully worked out the Niddesa scheme.[4] The later literature of the Jātaka class, excepting the selections, contains universally an account of the present existence of Gautama.

The Barhut scheme of Buddha's life, past and present, was further developed in the Jātaka-commentary, the Indian version of which seems to have been earlier than the Milinda. In the Introductory Section (Nidānakathā) we have an account of 25 Buddhas, including Gautama as the last, instead of seven in earlier schemes. Thus we have in hand three separate schemes of Gautama's present and past existences, which presuppose one another, each of them being a literary synthesis of earlier stories and legends. The Niddesa scheme, for instance, is a synthesis of the four earliest Suttantas, one of which, viz., the Mahāpadāna gives an account of the present existence, of Gautama, and the rest—the Mahāsudassana, the Mahāgovinda and the Makhādeva—give the stories of the past. The Barhut scheme is an elaboration of the Niddesa scheme with selections from the current commentary on the Jātaka Book and other existing compositions like the Khandakas of the Vinaya Piṭaka. The Commentarial scheme

[1] *Culla-Niddesa* p. 80.

[2] The Niddesa scheme is drawn up on the basis of four Suttanta Jātakas which comprise (*i*) the Mahāpadāniya Suttanta (*Dīgha, II*), (*ii*) the Mahāsudassaniya Suttanta (*Dīgha, II*), (*iii*) the Mahāgovindiya Suttanta (*Dīgha, II*), and (*iv*) the Maghādeviya Suttanta (= Makhādeva Sutta in the *Majjhima*).

[3] The point has been fully discussed by Rhys Davids in his *Buddhist India*, pp. 198 f.

[4] Cunningham, *Stūpa of Barhut*.

is, on the contrary, a synthesis of the Jātaka Book with its running commentary and of the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka among others. The Nidānakathā of the existing Jātaka Commentary is on the whole a co-ordination of the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka, both of which are quoted by name.[1] The notable feature in the Nidāna account of the present life of Gautama is that it establishes by the help of the Buddhavaṁsa Gautama's relation to his 24 predecessors and sets forth in the light of the Cariyāpiṭaka the ten perfectionary virtues (dasa pāramitā) which Gautama as a Bodhisattva fulfilled during his past existences, reckoned from the dispensation of the Buddha Dīpaṅkara. Since the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka are quoted in the Nidānakathā, they are necessarily earlier than the existing Jātaka commentary and must be placed earlier than the Milinda.

Looking at the genesis of these two texts, viz., the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka we cannot but be impressed by the fact that they were just the results of an analytic process which was going on in Buddhist literature between the two synthetic landmarks represented by the Barhut selections and the Jātaka Commentary, the Indian version of which is almost contemporaneous with the Milinda, if not earlier.

II. *The Buddhavaṁsa.*—It is a metrical version of, and a supplement to, the Mahāpadāna stories of seven Buddhas. The Mahāpadāna stories which are included in the Niddesa scheme as well as in that at Barhut do not bring out the historical relation of Gautama to his predecessors. Besides, the Mahāpadāna doctrine of *dhammatā* is illustrated only by the stories of seven Buddhas, past and present, and there is no mention of any future Buddha like Metteyya. On the other hand, the Buddhavaṁsa not only preserves in verse the old prose account of seven Buddhas (Vipassī to Gotama),

[1] Fausböll, *Jātaka*, I, pp. 1, 2, 3, 28, 47, 90; IV, 406.

but adds the stories of the 18 predecessors of Vipassī (Dīpaṅkara to Phussa) and mentions Metteyya as the Buddha to come, thus illustrating the *dhammatā* doctrine more fully than the Mahāpadāna. Because the account of Metteyya is absent from the Buddhavaṁsa, we are not to suppose that the popular belief in the future Buddha had not expressed itself in any concrete form. The Cakkavattisutta of the Dīgha III affords a nucleus of the legend of Metteyya in the prophecy put into the mouth of Gautama, the prose nucleus developed later in the Anāgatavaṁsa on the lines of the earlier Genealogy of the Buddhas. Tradition ascribes the Buddhavaṁsa and its sequel, the Anāgatavaṁsa, to Kassapa,[1] whom as originator and not in the traditional sense of author, I think to be no other than Kumārakassapa, because these Genealogical Legends developed from the earlier Jātaka literature with which he had so much to do. In the Buddhavaṁsa we have a regular genealogy of the Buddhas in the sense that their lives are linked together by the chain of existences undergone by the Bodhisattva of the present Buddha.[2] Thus the Buddhavaṁsa seeking to maintain the succession of the Buddhas by the Bodhisattva career of Gautama necessarily presupposes the Jātaka proper, i.e., the stories of the past, which the Mahāpadāna does not, since the stories of the Buddhas there are all detached, each relating to the present existence only of a Buddha. In other words, the Mahāpadāna is not a Book of Genealogy, but rather an historical basis of it. With the growth of the Book of Genealogy of the Buddhas from the Mahāpadāna the earlier *dhammatā* doctrine was supplemented and in a sense superseded by the *praṇidhāna* idea, a consummation of the earlier Indian conception of Faith (*Śraddhā*) viz., the belief that man becomes what he

[1] Index to the *Gandhavaṁsa*, J.P.T.S., 1896, pp. 54, 70.

[2] The earlier beginnings of this linking process are traceable in the *Suttanta Jātaka*, e.g., in the *Ghaṭikāra-sutta* of the Majjhima, where the present Buddha says that he was born as Jotipāla, the teacher in the dispensation of Kassapa the Buddha.

wishes to be, illustrated by the typical account of the hermit Sumedha, the first Bodhisattva who resolved to be a Buddha during the dispensation of Buddha Dīpaṅkara and realised his aspirations as Gautama.

Over and above this *praṇidhāna* doctrine, reinstating the ancient Indian conception of faith against the popular belief in fate, developed as a Law of Karma in the Jātaka cult, the genealogy of the Buddhas is of paramount importance in the history of Buddhism as being the literary record of an age, when the Buddhist theologian had to invent an antiquity as a prop to his faith, in its keen competition with the rival faiths that drew their authority from the remotest past. But the date of the Buddhavaṁsa shows that he was incapable of inventing the desired antiquity at once. Before any way could be made towards the lineage or the uniform succession of the Buddhas, the Buddhas themselves had to be distinguished as a class from the Paccekabuddhas and the Bodhisattas, and their number sufficiently multiplied. The lineage itself which was a new feature added in the Buddhavaṁsa to the earlier Buddhalogy of the Mahāpadāna could not alone suffice to convey the idea of antiquity. It was by the synthesis of the mythological lineage and the cosmological notion of infinitely recurring cycles of time (*kappas*) that the idea of antiquity was conveyed in the Buddhavaṁsa.

The question arises, could the Buddhist theologian achieve all this, if there had been no historical ground to build upon. The Majjhima Nikāya preserves in the Isigilisutta (III. 16) an old list of Paccekabuddhas who are otherwise designated seers (*isis*) and teachers (*satthā*), dwelling on a mountain, the Isigili Pabbata in Rājagaha. This curious list contains the names of Nemi, Sarabhaṅga and Kaṇha, who are treated in the Jātaka literature as Bodhisattas or previous incarnations of Gotama Buddha. This very list also mentions Piyadassī, Sikhi, Tissa, Maṅgala, Paduma, Padumuttara and Sobhita, who appear among the additional Buddhas past. Hence the

importance of the Majjima Discourse. It furnishes us with a list of Indian teachers or seers differentiated by the Buddhists into three distinct classes of heroes, namely, the Bodhisatta, the Paccekabuddha and the Sammāsambuddha. Next the Dhammikavagga of the Aṅguttara, [1] embodies a story of seven Brahman purohitas, Mahāgovinda and the rest, who are mentioned as celebrated Indian teachers. They, too, are treated in the Jātaka literature as Bodhisattas. These purohitas and such other Brahman teachers as Hārīta and Kaṇhadīpāyana are classed as Bodhisattas obviously on no other ground than that their instructions and personal examples were calculated to foster the Buddhist idea of renunciation.

Although this was the original idea attached to the Bodhisattas, Paccekabuddhas and Sammāsambuddhas, viz., that they were all Indian seers or teachers, it will be a mistake to suppose that they were all historical personages. Buddhalogy or the idea of Bodhisatta, Paccekabuddha or Buddha, must be treated as a mythological creation of the Buddhists. No historical value can be attached to this fanciful creation, which went on multiplying the numbers of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattas. The Aṭānāṭiyasuttanta which is later than the Mahāpadāna Book, furnishes a clue to the psychology which lay behind the multiplication. There we reach a stage of the Buddhist mythology characterised by belief in the existence of myriads of Buddhas as opposed to the earlier list of seven actually named. Hence the later additions of the names of Buddhas, e.g., in the Buddhavaṁsa and other later works, can be explained as giving a concrete shape to the vague belief in the indefinite number.

Now our question is, where lies the immediate background of the synthesis of the lineage and the cosmical eras, which we find in the Buddhavaṁsa. I would say that it is in two of the Suttanta-Jātakas, viz., the Mahāpadāna and the Mahāgovinda.

[1] *Aṅguttara*, III, pp. 368-373.

First, in the Mahāpadāna list of seven Buddhas we are supplied with a chronological succession [1], expressed in terms of cosmical eras (*kappas*). Examining this succession in the Mahāpadāna we notice two points :

1. That the first two Buddhas, Vipassī and Sikhi, are separated by an interval of 60 Kalpas, and the Buddhas Sikhi and Vessabhū, separated from the rest by an interval of 30 Kalpas.

2. That Vipassī is alone said to have flourished in one Kalpa ; Sikhī and Vessabhū are the two successors of Vipassī, who are relegated to one Kalpa, while four Buddhas (Kakusandha to Gotama) are associated with the current era characterised as "Lucky" (*Bhaddhakappa*). In the story of the Mahāgovinda Suttanta the gods of the Thirty-three rejoiced to see four Buddhas in the world or three or at least two, whereon Sakka, the king of the gods, impressed them with the idea that the world should consider itself fortunate, if it be blessed with the advent of one Buddha of the rank of Gotama, not to speak of four, or three or two. Sakka is at last represented as emphatically laying down a general rule that it is impossible that two Buddhas should arise simultaneously in one world system. These earlier speculations constitute the background, I say, because the synthesis in the Buddhavaṁsa is nothing but a crystallisation of these nebulous ideas. The doctrinal bearing of this synthesis is that it promulgates an abiding belief in the alternate evolutions and dissolutions of the world-system through vast and countless periods of time glorified by the sublime dispensations of the Buddhas. That is to say, Buddhism as the theologian tried to prove was not a new religion, but a recrudescence of what was believed to have existed through eternity—the best and the oldest of religions, acceptable to all.

[1] *Digha, II, p. 2. Ito so ekanavuto kappo yaṁ Vipassi......eka-tiṁso kappo yaṁ sikhi ...tasmim yeva kho...kappe Vessabhū...... imasmiṁ yeva kho bhikkhave Bhaddakappe ahaṁ (i.e. Gotamo etarahi arahaṁ sammasambuddho).*

III. *The Cariyāpiṭaka.*—It is a Jātaka selection similar to the Barhut. The *Praṇidhāna* doctrine developed in the Buddhavaṁsa left a question to be answered in the Cariyāpiṭaka. Taking for granted that the hermit Sumedha became in the present *lucky era* what he had resolved to be many Kalpas back during the dispensation of Buddha Dīpaṅkara, the Buddhist theologian had yet to explain the modes and methods whereby Sumedha's realisation of his aspiration was possible. Are we to believe, according to the ancient Indian conception of faith, that resolution alone suffices for the realisation? The Cariyāpiṭaka induces us to say, no. The path to realisation lies through resolution translated into action. The Buddhavaṁsa teaches what Will can do, the Cariyāpiṭaka inculcates how a Bodhisatta, who has made a resolve, ought to exercise his will in order to attain the goal, the *Sambodhi.* This is the justification of the title Cariyāpiṭaka, so aptly applied to a selection of Birth-stories. The very title signifies that the selection has to do with cariyā or practices, and in fact, the contents show that the selection is intended to propound a very special doctrine, *viz.*, that of *pāramitā*, which is tacitly implied in the earlier Jātaka cult. The doctrine is that the Bodhisatta, before he reaches his goal, has to practise the Perfectionary Virtues (*pāramis, pāramitās*) through a prolonged succession of births. Since the Cariyāpiṭaka defines by its *Pāramitā* doctrine the path to *Sambodhi,* it has the just claim to be considered as a complement to the Buddhavaṁsa. These *Praṇidhāna* and *Pāramitā* doctrines taken together embrace, exemplify and bear out the statement in the Majjhima (III. p. 99) where the Buddha emphatically formulates his idea of faith. Here is a summary of the statement. " When a Bhikkhu is endowed with faith, equipped with morality, replete with learning, adorned with character, filled with generosity and vested with wisdom, a right aspiration arises in him for the attainment of a higher condition of existence, on the dissolution of his body, after

death. The thought burns his heart, it occupies his mind and makes him excogitate. Such mental dispositions and in-dwellings of his, developed and enlarged in this manner, conduce to the attainment of the cherished end. This is the road, this the path, that leads to his goal."

The reader will observe that the interval between the resolution and the realisation, stated in general terms by the Buddha was extended in the Cariyāpiṭaka through Buddhalogy, so as to comprise several cycles of existence—a stretch of imagination proceeding perhaps from a loose literal interpretation and exaggeration of the expressions "on the dissolution of the body, after death" (*kāyassabhedā parammaraṇā*), a current popular idiom meaning the immediate future following the present existence, which Buddha Gotama may not have meant. The desired higher condition did not necessarily mean in Gotama's phraseology an existence hereafter as we commonly understand it. To suppose that it signifies 'hereafter' in its commonest acceptation is to lose sight of the Buddha spirit acutely expressed by "here and now" (*saṁdiṭṭhika akālika*) in the earlier characterisation of Dhamma.[1] Again, in the Sāmaññaphalasutta (Dīgha I.) we are supplied with a lengthly discourse of the Buddha on the immediate fruit of the recluse-life ripening in this present conscious existence (*saṁdiṭṭhika*). There are, again, a few significant words of the Buddha which are said to have been appealed to by the Buddhist thinkers of pre-Aśokan and post-Aśokan ages as authoritative pronouncements in support of their following views:

1. That the present alone exists.[2]

[1] *Dīgha Nikāya* II. p. 93. Also compare *Bhaddekarattasutta* Majjh. III. p. 187, where Buddha exhorts the bhikkhus with the words: *ajj eva kiccam āpannaṁ ko jaññe maraṇaṁ suve*, (Strive to-day, for who knows death will not come to-morrow).

[2] The *Kathāvatthu* commentary attributes this view to the Theravādins and Bhavya to the Old Sthaviras and the Sarvāstivādins (Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha*, pp. 190, 191). The *Kathāvatthu* itself (I. 7.) shows that the view was deduced from a statement of the Buddha preserved in the *Saṁyutta*, III. 71.—"That material body which has come to birth,

2. That man lives and dies every moment in the momentary happening of consciousness.[3]

Thus promulgating the belief that *sambodhi* is the richest fruit of human efforts continued through almost innumerable cycles of individual existence, the Cariyāpiṭaka seems to have lost sight of the Buddha spirit of energy and brought forward a new philosophy of life suited to the temperament of the general run of Indian people whom the enervating climate of India tended to make easy-going. It appears that the Cariyāpiṭaka was but a production of a decadent age when Buddhahood or Arahatship was idealised to such an enormous extent and conceived so far beyond human reach as to give rise to a belief that there was no Buddha or no Arahat in the world at the time. The *Cariyā* doctrine, I am of opinion, is post-Aśokan. For I notice that in the pre-Aśokan views of salvation which formed the ground for the growth of the *Cariyā* doctrine, there is no idea of a futurity beyond this life and ranging over countless cycles of existence. In the Kathāvatthu (I. 4; II. 9) we come across two views, which the commentator ascribes to the Sammitīyas, Sabbatthivādins and Bhadrayānikas and, among the post-Aśokan schools, to the Andhakas:—(1) The Aryan puts away the impurities step by step (*odhiso-odhiso*), or, as the commentator puts it, "by one portion at a time." The same idea is expressed in another controversy in these words:—(2) penetration is acquired in segmentary order. These two statements embrace

has appeared, is reckoned, termed, named, "exists," but is not reckoned as "has been," nor as "will be" (Points of Controversy, p. 95).

[3] The *Kathāvatthu* commentary attributes this view to three schools—*viz.*, Vajjiputtaka, Sammitīya and Andhaka, the first two of which are pre-Asokan and the third post-Aśokan. See *Kathāvatthu* I. 1. art. 193; II. 7. The view is said to have been based upon such Canonical passages as *Aṅguttara* i. 10 and *Saṁyutta* ii. 95. q. v.; cf. ***Mahāniddesa***, p. 117:

jīvitaṃ attabhāvo ca sukhadukkhā ca kevalā, ekacitta-samāyuttā lahuso vattati khaṇo.

[4] The gradual degeneration of the Buddha-spirit of energy in the popular Buddhist faith is patent. A pious Buddhist of Ceylon, Burma or Chittagong, evinces a wish to attain salvation in the dispensation of the future Buddha Metteya,

but the positive and negative sides of one and the same view, *viz.*, that the process of self-realisation is gradual. This theory of life appears to have been a deduction from a metaphysical doctrine of the Sammitīyas and Vajjiputtakas, of the gradual development of self-consciousness, loosely denominated as *puggala*, personality or *jīva*, living soul, passing from one state of existence to another.[1] Thus the Sammitīya doctrine may on the whole be pointed out as the historical background of the *Cariyā* doctrine. The main point of difference between the two is that the Sammitīya doctrine is devoid of all mythological implications attaching to Buddhalogy engrafted on the fanciful notions of cosmical eras which characterise the *Cariyā* doctrine. The complete assimilation of the three distinct ideas: (1) the *puggala* passing from one state of existence to another, (2) the progressive course of enlightenment and (3) the cosmical eras embracing innumerable cycles of existence—could not be reached until after Aśoka. The side-light that can be obtained from the inscriptions of the Great Mauryan brings within our vision a stage earlier than that of the *Cariyā* doctrine. For there we find a belief in a glorious hereafter as a heavenly reward for energetic efforts in this world.[2] The futurity vaguely expressed in the royal belief in heavenly reward does not seem to imply any more than an immediate future following the present existence.

The Cariyāpiṭaka combining in one doctrine, beliefs in rebirth, comsical eras and progressive course of *sambodhi* formed the literary basis of the later Mahāyāna system of training of the Bodhisattas expounded in the Śikṣāsamuccaya the Daśabhumīśvara, and the Bodhicaryāvatāra, to mention only the standard works. Thus it afforded a medium through which Buddhalogy with its novel theories approached the

[1] *Kathāvatthu* I. 1. art. 158.

[2] E.g. Rūpnāth Edict: *khuddakena hi ka pi pakamanena sakiye pipule pi evage ārodheve.*

Āśrama theory of the Brahmans. It is interesting to note here that in the Gaṇaka-Moggallāna Sutta (Majjh. III. 1) Buddha made an approach to the Brahman method of training, the *Āśrama* theory of education conceived in an ascending numerical order, as a graduated system.[1] If there is any resemblance in this instance of adaptation, it does not appear to have extended beyond the fact that the Buddha also came to feel the want of conceiving a system of his own on a graduated scale for the proper guidance of his followers at large. I am not here to investigate the points of resemblance between the two systems. Without going into such details I may notice that their underlying theories and motives differed. For while the Brahmanical system of education was conceived on a par with the natural gradations of existence, and justified itself by a metaphysical theory of the gradual development of self, Buddha's system lacked that general regulative principle which the Brahmanist deduced from their conception of life on a basis of heredity. Failing a deductive construction from a universal theory of life, Buddha's system could not claim for its justification anything but a practical expediency, suggested by the varied mentality of his followers, recruited from different social grades with a view to constituting one common brotherhood. The very idea of a system was rather a concession, a legitimate concession, one may say, to the general shortcomings of human nature, than necessity arising from the very constitution of our mind. His conception of mind as supremely radiant (*pabhassara*) by nature was prejudicial to all ideas of stereotyped system except for the training of those whose mind was tainted by impurities foreign to its nature (*āgantūkadosehi paduṭṭha*). The Buddha introduced in this manner a new system based upon the general psychology of human mind and not upon the hereditary stronghold of

[1] *Brāhmaṇānaṃ hi anupubbasikkhā anupubbakiriyā anupubbapaṭipada yathā ajjhene.*

caste-system, thus affording a free scope for the natural self-determination of those who possessed strong common sense or intuition. But in its approach to the established Brahmanical system of training, the *Cariyā* doctrine afforded a universal regulative principle proceeding as a deduction from the underlying belief in the moral self-evolution of the Bodhisattva who is a member of Buddha-clan through countless cycles of existence, in other words, from a principle of ideal heredity of culture associated with the mythological creation of Buddha-genealogy.

IV. *The Apadāna.* It is the Book of Legends, consisting of autobiographical ballads, where the Arahat followers of the Buddha, *Theras* and *Theris,* recount their past existences with special reference to those incidents, religious experiences and acts of piety, which had shaped their destinies culminating in Arahatship. The legends are introduced by general description of Buddhahood, distinguished into two types—the state of the Buddha and that of the Paccekabuddha. Thus the Apadāna may be regarded as a supplement to the Buddhavaṁsa in the sense that it adds the accounts of the Theras and the Theris on the lines of the Great Legend (the Mahāpadāna) of the Buddhas. We say that the Apadāna was a supplement because the Buddhavaṁsa with its Buddha-legends could not alone suffice to impress the mighty point and magnificent work of faith, without similar legends of *Theras* and *Theris* who were Buddha's followers, co-workers and the mainstay of the Faith. The particular *Theras* and *Theris* immortalised by the Apadāna are those who were the followers of Gautama the present Buddha. The Apadāna brings out by the legends of *Theras* and *Theris* a special feature of the doctrine of piety, and this specialisation seems to establish a logical connection of the book with the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka. The Buddhavaṁsa by its *Praṇidhāna* doctrine teaches, as we noticed, what Will can do, the Cariyāpiṭaka by its *Pāramitā* doctrine teaches how

the Will should be exercised by piety among other virtues, and it was left to the Apadāna to teach how reverence and loving regard should be shown to those personages, the heroes of a nation, whose words, blessings and sacred memory are a source of inspiration and solace. Thus while the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka impressed on people the education of will and intellect, the Apadāna was concerned with the cultivation of proper religious sentiments or feelings of devotional love and humbleness of spirit, finding expression in acts of piety. The doctrine upheld in the Apadāna is what may be technically called *Adhikāravāda*, which means that it is necessary to establish a claim to Arahatship by homage and such other acts of piety. In other words, the Apadāna proceeded to show that human success and future greatness depends not on individual will and energetic effort alone, but on the guidance, sympathy and grace (*anubhāva*) of those who are accounted as cherished teachers, and on a reciprocal reverence for them accompanied by regard for the existing system and religious tradition.

I maintain that the Apadāna, along with the Buddhavaṁsa and the Cariyāpiṭaka, is post-Aśokan in date, and I think that the popular idea of piety inculcated on an extensive scale in the Apadāna is in itself a sufficient evidence. An analysis of the legends sets forth that the Apadāna idea of piety did not extend beyond the worship of the Buddhas or their relics and shrines, by offerings and homage, nor beyond the belief that salvation was ensured by the feeling of joy, intense and spontaneous, resulting from such worships.

The immediate background of the Apadāna doctrine of piety lies, I believe, in the stories of the Vimānavatthu, which bears a close resemblance in teaching with the inscriptions of Aśoka. The phases of belief which have found expression in the Vimānavatthu are characterised by a humanizing spirit rendering the abstract concrete or practical. The stories teach that the householders can become dwellers of celestial

mansions which vary in glory and splendour according to the merits gained by the following acts of piety and religious observances (*dhammacariyā*) :—

(*a*) Faith in the Three Jewels (*tiratanesu saddhā*).

(*b*) *Buddhavandanā*—Various modes of salutation to the Buddha, touching his feet (*pādavandanā*) or with folded hands (*añjalikamma*), with a mind transported with joy (*muditamano*), and a heart serene (*pasannacitto.*)

(*c*) *Buddhapūjā*—Worshipping the Buddha with offerings of flowers and perfumes.

(*d*) *Cetiyavandanā, Thupapūjā, Dhātu-pūja*—Worship of shrines, topes and relics.

(*e*) Observance of the *Upasotha.*

(*f*) Keeping the precepts (*sīlasamādāna*).

(*g*) *Kiccāni*—Fulfilment of duties by man and woman.

(*h*) *Āsana*—Cordial reception of the Buddha and his followers.

(*i*) *Dāna*—Liberal gifts of food and drink, and other requisites to the Buddha and the Order.

(*j*) *Vihāradāṇa*—Dedication of *Vihāras* to the Buddha and the Order.

(*k*) *Bhikkhādāna*—Alms-giving.

(*l*) *Ārāma-ropā, Vana-ropā, Caṅkama, Pokkharaṇi*—Laying out of gardens, planting of trees, construction of roads, and excavation of tanks.

(*m*) *Rathapadīpādi*—Gifts of chariots and provision of lights, etc.

(*n*) *Puññānumodanā*—Participation in virtuous deeds.

These Vimāna ideas of piety were intensified later in the legends of the Apadāna which virtually did away with the precepts and duties of life, and emphasized only such formal aspects of religion as *Pujā, Vandanā, Dāna* and *Dakṣiṇā.* Among other differences, the following are the most noticeable :—

1. Like the inscriptions of Aśoka, the Vimāna stories

hold out for the householder a promise of heavenly reward generally in the immediate future,[1] while the Apadāna legends invariably illustrate by the lives of Theras and Theris how heavenly rewards thus obtained are continued through many cycles of existence and multiplied, until these lead to Arahatship.

2. The Vimānavatthu sets out a religion for the householder, stripped of the idea of renunciation, whereas the Apadāna legends combine by a peculiar mythological device the pious life of the householder with the higher attainments of the recluse, the latter overshadowing the former—a synthesis unknown in the time of Aśoka.

3. The Vimāna stories promulgate generally the worship of the present Buddha [2] with his doctrine and followers, while the Apadāna legends by their Adhikāravāda exalt the past Buddhas and brings into prominence the worship of shrines, relics and topes.

4. The emphasis laid in the Vimāna stories is on the whole on individual morality and duty, while the Apadāna legends emphasize mainly the æsthetic, charitable and humanitarian aspects of the faith.

It seems as if the Vimānavatthu and the Apadāna represent the two sides of Aśoka's religion. For the instructions in Aśoka's inscriptions are only a reproduction of the teachings of the Vimānavatthu,[3] and the Apadāna legends are nothing but the embodiment of Aśoka's personal practices. And the conflict between the Vimāna and Apadāna doctrines is the same as that between Aśoka's teachings and practices. What we find in Aśokan inscriptions is in spirit but a faithful reproduction of the Buddha idea of

[1] The Vimāna story of Revatī (No. 52) which also occurs as a Peta-story in the *Petavatthu* is one of the few exceptions.

[2] The Vimāna story (No. 82) which mentions Sumedha, a past Buddha, is one of the few exceptions.

[3] Notably the Vimāna story of Revatī (No. 52).

worship, which consists in following his instructions and not in personal homage and offerings, the foolish ways of common people.[1] But in his personal practices Aśoka himself appears to have followed a mode of worship which the Buddha had denounced as vulgar. In the history of this conflict between the two forms of Buddha worship, the Apadāna marks a stage in the growth of the Buddhist creed when the ethical side practically disappeared yielding place to the popular. The result was that the emotional side of the faith devoured its previous rationality (*paññānvayatā*).[2]

The *Adhikāravāda* of the Apadāna combines two elements —the *Gṛhya* and the *Śrāmaṇya.* We have seen above that the background of the *Gṛhya* religion is in the Vimānavatthu. But we have to enquire, where lies the background of *Śrāmaṇya,* the religion of the recluses. I think it is in the earlier extant songs of the Theras and the Theris.

We have in the existing Pâli Canon two anthologies of the psalms of the early Buddhists—Theras and Theris, the former numbering 259, and 264 including the duplicated names,[3] and the latter 73.[4] Among the Theras and Theris named there are a number of historical persons whose dates range from Buddha to Aśoka. For instance, the commentator Dhammapāla singles out Tekicchakāri as a Thera whose father was banished by Candagutta Moriya, who, therefore, may be taken as a contemporary of king Bindusāra, the son and successor of Candagutta. Among the contemporaries and relatives of king Aśoka, the commentator mentions Vītasoka, and Prince Tissa called Ekavihāriya in the text, as Theras who were brothers to

[1] *Mahāparinibbāna suttanta* in the *Dīgha*, II, p. 138.

[2] Cf. *paññanvayā saddhā* in the *Saṁyutta*, V, p. 222.

[3] Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Psalms of the Brethren*, Introduction, p. xxvii.

[4] Müller, *Paramatthadīpanī*, Introduction, p. ix.

the Great Maurya. Of the Theris none are mentioned by the commentator as belonging to the time of the Mauryans or later. That the *gāthās* ascribed to these Theras and Theris were all really uttered by them, no one can believe. This is not to deny that there are many genuine utterances or self-expressions of the poetically gifted brethren and sisters. Whether the Theras and the Theris were all historical personages or not, whether the stanzas bequeathed to us under their names be all their genuine utterances or not, we cannot but be struck by the fact that the stanzas were all to the same purpose, to bring out the same phase of belief, to promulgate the same doctrine of self-expression (*aññāvāda*) to inculcate the same *dhammatā*, or the order of the norm (*niyāma*), wherein holiness is the natural expression of what Mrs. Rhys Davids characteristically denominates the Arahant's "mental and moral being." This self-expression which characterises the psalms is but an outward indication of the inner conviction of a Buddhist saint when he has reached the purest state of consciousness by means of meditation.

In the Apadāna, one can find another redeeming feature of the Buddhist faith which is absent from the original teachings of the Buddha, viz., the germ of a conception of Paradise in its charming description of *Buddha-Khetta*, the conception that was so much developed afterwards in the well-known Mahāyāna work, the Sukhāvatī-Vyūha.

BAMMERA POTANAMATYA

K. RANGACHARI, M.A., LECTURER IN TELUGU, UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA.

As is the case with many great poets of Āndhradeśa we do not possess any records dealing with the life and times of Bammera Potanamatya, the great translator of *Śrīmad Bhāgavatam* into Telugu. Supreme was the indifference of these great men with regard to their own lives and they never thought of leaving to their successors any information concerning themselves beyond the bare mention of their own and their parents' names and their writings. Most of them had disciples, who were poets not unknown to fame, but who were never guilty of being Boswells to their own masters; and our poet forms no exception, even though he had students, who perhaps at his bidding aided him in his work, translating no inconsiderable portions of it. But it is not surprising to us to find it so when we find our ancestors so deeply attached to what they conceived to be the true lives of those fabulous gods and heroes and *Avatāras* of Viṣṇu. But human nature cannot be disregarded; and so we find [1] works which ostensibly are biographies of those great men who, imperishable in their works, live for ever, but which containing as they do an unbelievable mass of improbable, impossible and fictitious matter, make themselves books of fairy tales. Returning to our author we find references to him in the works of some of his successors, but never do we find any matter concerning his life save the mere mention of his name. No material exists out

[1] *Vararuci* and *Kālidāsa Caritams*.

of which we can construct the biography of this great man, who moves men's souls as few can do, and we fear the life he lived will ever remain unknown. Traditional stories somewhat in the nature of anecdotes are found current about him, but we do not know how far reliance can be placed upon them. There are cases when many places claim the same poet, as we find the house in which the five Pāṇḍavas were born in many a nook and corner of this vast country divided by great distances. In the following pages we take such anecdotes as are extremely probable and which are not inconsistent with the character of our poet.

But then there is the question whether the published writings of the poet offer us any help with regard to the matter in hand. The author does enter into his work in a sense other than the following. He cannot escape from himself when he goes on writing; but seldom, almost never, do we find great poets making their works the receptacles of their biographic details. The works reflect the poet and perhaps it is this image that is of greater importance to us than those details about his height and weight, his personal appearance, his eccentricities and his little weaknesses. What is preserved to us of him in his works, provided it is rightly read and understood, would give us all that we need know about him which is much more than what a cartload of details about his daily life and actions could ever do.

It is not possible for us to deal with the state of the country in those days in any way commensurate with its importance to our subject. The history of the Āndhras, we mean a fair account of how they lived then, is yet to be written. But in a rough way we may say that the country was divided into many principalities, some of them big and others small. The Muhammadan kingdoms of the South were in existence and their powerful rival the Vijayanagar Empire which afterwards subjugated them was making itself stronger. Each petty prince was supreme in his small principality. We do

not know with certainty, and we doubt very much, whether there was any security of life and property. As in such cases, where a single man ruled with almost absolute powers, the state of the country depended upon the personal character of the individual ruler. It is in the experience of old men still alive how these petty tyrants rule, and from their experience we can picture to ourselves the state of the country under such absolute rulers.

But from this, it must not be misunderstood that these princes ever proved tyrants to the poets and bards in any way; and in those rare instances in which they did we find how they fared in the contest that ensued between themselves and the poor bards.[1] The princes always courted the poets' friendship and treated them munificently, showering upon them presents and wealth. We may say that they bribed the poets taking from them in return lavish praise. It was in a way an alliance [2] between the rich and powerful aristocracy and the poor but intelligent Brāhmaṇa. Those were the days when literature was under the patronage of rich nobles, princes and kings; in a word literature was patronised by the aristocracy. The masses had nothing to do with these literary productions and we fear they were seldom influenced by them. The literature which belonged to the masses, briefly the democratic literature, was composed of ballads [3] and some *Śatakams* like *Vemana* and *Dāśarathī Śatakam.* And perhaps this fact explains to some extent why most of the literary works which were

[1] *Candralekhāvilāpam.*

[2] The help of the Brāhmaṇas was very necessary to the princes to keep back the advance of the masses in the interests of their power. Rulers from Śudra castes like Reddis, Velamas and Kamnas seem to have especially courted the help of the poets and literary men, as we find them treating their court poets with a respect which has hardly been paralleled in any other country.

[3] These ballads contain such poetic merit that they demand separate study for themselves. For a certain crude native vigour of their language and for the stirring description of heroic actions and deeds they may take their place in the world's ballad literature with *Chevy Chase*, etc.

composed under aristocratic patronage were artificial and insincere and soulless, works dealing with the loves of those whom we may call after the western fashion, "knights, and ladies." They carried about the air of the aristocratic society and highest classes. The authors never thought of writing for the masses and would have repudiated with disdain any such suggestion. Leaving the acknowledged translations of Sanskrit works what do we find in this section of Āndhra literature which rose up in princely courts and under the direct patronage of the aristocracy of the land ? We find mostly *Prabandhams* written in the style of the *Naiṣadha* with a plot of very flimsy structure, or we may say the meagrest that could be conceived, and which, if plainly told, may be told in half a dozen lines. There we find verses almost like the verses given as examples in a book on rhetoric and where great feats of jugglery with metre are performed which possess not a single genuine poetic quality. There are the stereotyped descriptions of rivers and mountains, of cities and of the men of the four castes. There are the hero and heroine seeing each other for the first time and all the story of love at first sight follows. There is their consequent pining for each other till they are brought together by happy chance or through the work of their nearest friends. There are the time-honoured complaints of ladies languishing from love made to all the trees and all the birds which bring after all no relief. The marriages come off mostly in *Gandharva* form and long sections deal with their married life, but not a single thought about true honest love finds a single expression. The original Adam and Eve thus dressed in modern clothes revelling in most beautiful grottos and most beautiful gardens are placed before us for our instruction and enjoyment. All this is very pleasing to the aristocrats ; all is brilliant, only the brilliance is superficial, unwholesome and nauseating. All this is put into a number of

cantos, generally five, running according to strict rules propounded by Sanskrit grammarians and rhetoricians. It is indeed very difficult to see distinctly how these works are Āndhra at all except in their language. And with regard to the language itself we find it very heavily sanskritised; the works bristling with Sanskrit compounds which would rouse the envy even of a Bāṇa. Beyond the sweet and smooth running of the verses, it is not possible for us to see much that is distinctly poetic in most of the works which were written by men of great talent under the patronage of princes.[1]

The place where Potanamatya spent his days or at least wrote his works was Ekaśilānagaram, for the poet himself speaks of "getting up and returning to Eksilanagaram after some days". Perhaps he was born there. But then there is a section of critics who maintain that it was Ontimetta in the modern Cudappah District in the Madras Presidency, while another identifies it with Orugallu in the present Nizam's Dominions. Literally *gallu* means a stone, while *metta* means a hillock. Since there is no evidence which gives us any definite information about his birthplace and as there is a coincidence between *Ekaśilā* and *Orugallu* which cannot be ignored, we may take that place to be his native place.[2]

With regard to the time of our poet we are on surer ground here than in the above case, as he was the relation of another great Āndhra poet Śrīnātha. Śrīnātha writes, "Oh Muse, how will you win for me in future the praise of the very learned Ravu Singa Mahīpāla", from which we gather that he was patronised by a king named Sarvajna Sangamanīdu who

[1] The system of religion and the ideas about society which belonged to our ancestors, where authority held such way, explain to some extent why such a literature came into existence.

[2] For an exhaustive discussion about this question a reference may be made to Jayanti Ramayya's article on "Bammera Potaraju" in the *Journal of the Telegu Academy*, July, 1916.

ruled Venkatagari[1] from 1422 to 1447 A. D. Thus we may take that our poet lived in the earlier half of the 15th century.

We can see from the following verses that he was the second son of Kesanamantri and Lakkamamba:

1. Annaya was the son of the virtuous blessed Bhimanamantri, who was of lineage of Kouṇḍinya and who followed *Āpastambha Sūtra.* His wife Gauramamba of sweet voice gave birth to Somanamantri by the favour of the Sun-God. His wife was Mallama and their son was Yellana whose wife was Machama. Their son of charming appearance, increaser of family and a storehouse of many practical arts, and one who was rich in his charity, honour and wisdom was Kesana who taking Lakkamamba for his wife embraced *Śaivamatam.*

2. Lakkamamba receiving the praise of wise men would not go out of her house, would not discuss other men's characters, would not cross her husband's words and would not give up kindness and charity.

3. Other women are not equal to her who removed the sorrows of the poor by her presents, who was the seat of charity, duty, honour, sweetness and earnestness, who was a woman of beauty, and who was like Pārvatī in worshipping the feet of Śiva, compassion, wise speech.

4. To that good lady we two were born, the eldest Tippana a man devoted to the worship of Śiva and myself named Potana who am a pursuer of good ways.

His father who became a convert to Śaivism after his marriage with Lakkamamba seems to have been a remarkable man with very strong religious feelings and vastly learned. His learning and his character commanded the respect of his gifted son. But our poet appears to have loved his mother with great tenderness which can be found from the verses given above. What his childhood was we do not know, but the way in which he treats his boy characters seems to be strongly reminiscent of his own.

As we have said before poets and learned men attached themselves to courts of distinguished princes and under their patronage which was in most cases liberal and munificent

[1] From the records of the Venkatagiri House.

wrote their works dedicating them to their patrons. Learning till very recently in the Āndhra country was the monopoly of the Brāhmaṇas and it is very rare for us to meet with poets or literary men rising from the other castes except in few cases[1] like that of Kumārī Molla, the famous lady poet who wrote the story of *Rāmāyaṇa* in sweet flowing numbers hardly surpassed in Telugu Literature.

These Brāhmaṇas from very early age were taught Sanskrit; and Sanskrit was to India what Latin was to mediæval Europe. If works on philosophy or religion or science intended for the learned of all India had to be written, then invariably they were written in Sanskrit. It was not rare also for men to write literary works in the classical language, as we find that even till recently men did not realise the absurdity of writing any work of really poetic value in a language which though not dead is still so far away from men's lives as not to be easily amenable for that masterly use which a vernacular is amenable to. Carlyle observes in his *Essay on Burns* that his Scotch songs were really poetic compositions which his English poems were not. And perhaps the artificiality which we notice in the Āndhra *Prabandhams* was to some extent due to their being overloaded with Sanskrit as we find whole verses composed of Sanskrit words ending only with Telugu terminations! For both secular and religious purposes Sanskrit was essential to the Brāhmaṇa; and this explains to some extent why the classical language entered so largely into their compositions. Nourished on the vast store of the Aryan culture which is preserved to us in Sanskrit books and cherishing it with an intense love, as it gave them all they prized and secured them their position, these poets, mostly Brāhmaṇas, based their works on Sanskrit models; and excepting in those rare instances in which the authors set themselves the task of giving

[1] Another notable exception we find in Śrī Krishna Devaraya, the famous king of Vijayanagar who was the author of *Amuktamalyada*, a Telugu *Prabandham*.

the vernacular the primary place in their works, we never find books in which Saṇskrit occupies a secondary place. Indeed the question how far Āndhra literature belonging to this section reflects Āndhra life and genius is a very pertiment one whose solution would be very instructive; but it is beyond the scope of this essay. Gifted Āndhras had hitherto neglected the study and cultivation of their popular literature with the result that even now we find imitations of the works of the 16th and 17th centuries, where hyperbolical hyperbole, extraordinary artificiality and glaring insincerity run riot. With the rapid changes which men's ideas have undergone and the fast disappearance of a state of society which helped the growth of verse of the type above mentioned, we find the signs of a better order of things coming into existence though it has been ushered in by a curious state of activity the outcome of which mostly is the production, I may almost say manufacture as toys are turned out in a toy factory, of novels innumerable, mostly absurd imitations of Scott and Bankim Chandra, Medows Taylor and G. A. Henty, where there is neither good plot, nor good characterisation, nor pleasing style.

But returning to our subject we find that the first question which demands our study is Potanamatya *the man.* Finding no biography of our author we naturally turn to his work, but strangely his sole extant production[1] is a translation which makes us think that very little can be gleaned of our author from it. But no great genius like Potana even though he translates can lose his identity so far as to be unrecognisable in it. In the mighty crucible of his soul the material is transfused and is poured forth again tinged with the colour of his genius. Certainly the orginal is there, but how gloriously changed! The Omar Khayyam translated by Fitzgerald into

[1] There is a tradition which attributes to him a small poetic piece called *Bhoginīdaṇḍakam* and also a work called *Vīrabhadravijayam*. We cannot believe these to be his works. For reasons refer to Śrī Ramamurti's *Lives of Telugu Poets.*

English is not the Omar Khayyam in the Persian tongue but the Omar Khyyam of Fitzgerald reflecting him and his genius. The Āndhra *Bhāgavatam* is the *Bhāgavatam* of Potana and in it we find his radiant soul pouring forth in torrents its vast riches uplifting and elevating all those who chance to read it. Therein you find his own interpretation of life. The original outline is there but how coloured in new colours!

Potana was a poor Brāhmaṇa rich in his spiritual wealth. As is widely current in Āndhradeśa in his boyhood, Potana was tending cows, which shows in what extreme poverty his childhood was cast; his tutelary God was Śrī Krishna and He was also a tender of cows, at least in His childhood though not in His maturer life. No honest work which would fetch him his daily bread was mean or disgusting to him. He had in him the spirit of the old Sages and of the Brāhmaṇa scholars whose meagre fare and contemptuous disregard of even the necessities of life has been proverbial. He seems to have had the truest conceptions of a poet's life and work. All the more is his example noble in an age when poets turned their divine gifts to mercenary uses securing for themselves wealth and luxuries. He was witnessing in the life of his own relation Śrīnātha how a man by selling his divine powers to rich princes and kings could lead a life of extreme opulence and luxury. How absurd would it have been to a man like Potana the lament of Śrīnātha for his vanished golden bow and musk.

And such sights conveyed to him nothing but disgust. Such luxury was not only unnecessary to him but positively repulsive. The hardest life to him was not incompatible with the noblest and the highest use of intellect. Poverty was not an impediment to his literary activities. It may surprise us of this age how in such circumstances he could do his mighty work though to India such examples of literary heroes[1] were not unknown. When lesser difficulties shattered the lives of

[1] See, for instance, the life of Vedānta Deśika, the great southern scholar and poet.

promising geniuses, as happened to Burns in the 18th century, we see the true heroic nature of the man, who careless of the gibes and mockeries of his pleasure-loving fellow poets, unyielding under trials of poverty and unsubdued by the cruel and ferocious threats of vain monarchs, whose offers of patronage were discarded with supreme indifference, worked on and on rising to sublime heights of imagination hardly surpassed in any literature, leading a life of heroic devotion to a noble task. Magnificent are the ways of the great!

We have always believed that if some happy chance brought to the light of day some authentic records of this man's life, his trials and his difficulties and his glorious successes, it would be a veritable heroic poem to men of this age. In lieu of this we have to draw such help from tradition as is consistent with reason and a right reading of his work. From what we read and hear we may say that his boyhood was not spent under the tutelage of a *guru*. But a Brāhmaṇa family is a school where boys learn without knowing that they do so. Particularly in such a family as Potanna's where the parents were such as they were described to be later on by their great son, a boy like young Potanna would have learnt much more than under the instruction of a teacher. The learned father with strong religious feelings and the loving mother with her piety and learning were his best teachers at home, where without hardship and with thorough sympathy the young and tender child, our future poet, would gather knowledge. We can easily realise how boys with a keen imagination and good powers of understanding learning quite early the beautiful *Purāṇa* stories are influenced by them. Perhaps in many cases amongst such it is this that colours very strongly their maturer life. We read that Sivaji's soul, when he was a boy, was fired with enthusiasm to do something to his country and his race by hearing the tales of mighty heroes, like Arjuna, Bhīma and

Droṇa and of statesmen like Śrī Krishna. Our poet, born as he was into such family, would have learnt the mere rudiments of learning at a very early age. Tending cows during day time, he might have been learning his lessons from his parents in the early morning and at night. This is not mere conjecture, for such examples are not rare even now. His cow-tending business made him keep company with Nature and thus unconsciously he was brought under her powerful influence. Some may be inclined to laugh at this as due to the writer's imagination; but such do not understand the mighty influence which Nature exerts upon a poetic temperament. It has been seen in many a poet's life how his early association with Nature brought into his writings a certain freshness as of green fields, a certain charm as of early dawn and an imaginative splendour as of the mid-day sun. However bound a poet is by certain conventions, provided he grew in the company of Nature, his work bears distinct marks of her wholesome influence. Even in a *Prabandham* like *Manucaritam* by Peddanamatya [1] where the crushing rules of the rhetorician are meekly borne, the descriptions of natural scenery, which add so much charm to it, describe the scenery round and near Bangalore lessening the note of artificiality which characterise most works belonging to this class, as a great Andhra scholar has remarked. Such were perhaps the influences under which our author grew, though we have no means of establishing or refuting them.

There is a story current to the effect that he was taught by one Chidānandayogi whom he casually met one noon and whom he pleased by his precocious intellect and sweet humility. This is a very plausible story and could be believed in but for the direct testimony of the poet to the effect that he was self-educated. The author styles himself as a man of self-acquired learning. This is not very material to our subject

[1] Peddanamatya was perhaps the best amongst the *Aṣṭa-diggajas* of Śrī Krishna Devarāya, the great king who ruled the Vijayanagar Empire.

and we may leave it to recount the remaining facts of his life which are very few.

He visited Benares as he tells us and one moonlit night after bathing in the sacred river Ganges,[1] and on performing *Māheśvara Japam* on its banks, he saw before him a Prince of divine appearance who making Himself known as Śrī Rāma asked him to translate the *Bhāgavatam.* Saying this He disappeared. This might have been a hallucination; but it shows us that the poet already formed by that time somewhat clear notions of his future activities in which his overpowering energy could find adequate employment. He might have been still by that time unsettled in his work but this vision definitely shaped his future course. On returning home, which he did soon after, and after completing the rites which such a pilgrimage requires he set himself to the work of translating the *Bhāgavatam* into Telugu. After what period he completed his work we do not know, nor at what period of his life he commenced it. But when he did, Sarvajña Sangamanīdu a great scholar and patron of learning sent Śrīnātha in splendid style to influence Potanna to dedicate his work to him. Śrīnātha met him ploughing his field and mockingly said " Are you a farmer ? " Then Potanna's great spirit bursts out in a noble verse which in burning words describes the misery of a poet who sells himself for money and in which he enunciates the principles that should guide the life of a noble poet :

" Rather than eat the food of evil purchased by prostituting to bad men the sweet maidens of their works, tender as the new-born twig of a young mango tree, what if good poets turn farmers or go in search of roots and such other things in remote forest-lands to maintain their lawfully wedded wives and children ? "

Sarasvatī appears to him in a dream weeping. The verse which tradition ascribes to him in which he consoles her is :

[1] There was a good deal of controversy going on some time back about the river referred to by Potana, some holding that it was not the Ganges but the Godavary.

"O beloved daughter-in-law of the slayer of Kaiṭabha Rākṣasa (Viṣṇu)! O my mother, why do you cry till tears dyed black with the collyrium used for your eyelashes fall on your breasts? O Queen of Suvarṇagarbha (Brahmā) I will not carry you and sell you to satisfy my hunger to the barbarous Karṇāṭakas. Believe me absolutely, O Bhāratī."

The verse perhaps shows us that he was being tempted and the devil was finally cast from him by that noble vision. Sarvajña Sangamanīdu was trying his best to get from Potanna the dedication of his work, a thing for which Andhra kings would have done anything; but all his attempts were absolutely futile. Thus discarded and unable to do anything, the prince, as the tradition asserts, wanted brute force to get the book burnt, and it was not till his queen interceded with him that he allowed it to see the light of day.

Leaving these matters aside let us glance briefly at the work itself. As it exists to-day it is not the sole creation of Potanna, but there are other names[1] associated with his. The causes for this are various, as given by critics, but, whatever they might be, we are not concerned with them as the best work comes directly from his hands stamped with his genius and bearing witness to his gigantic personality. The original contains 22,000 verses while the translation runs to 30,000 verses. The poet himself says

"Who is able to clearly explain *Bhāgavatam* excepting Śuka and Srī Krishna. I will write as I have grasped by my intellect, heard from wise men, and understood by my devotion."

Thus he does not simply translate the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatam* but puts into it what he has read himself and what he has learnt from the learned in his conversation with them. As Pandits have pointed out, the Vedantic disquisitions owe much to the famous commentaries. In some places,

[1] Veligandala Naraya, Erchuri Singana.

where the matter is dismissed in a single verse in the original our author develops it into many verses distinctly improving upon the original. In some cases we find new ideas introduced into the translation and their appropriateness and the beauty which they add to the work make us bold to say that some of the best in the work is due solely to Potanna himself.

We would not dare to attempt here any textual criticism of this mighty work, and it is beyond our purpose to do so. The Vedantic system of philosophy and similar matters will not be touched upon except very slightly when dealing with his religion.

Some are prone to think that Potanna being a mere translator was not a creative genius. Let us briefly touch upon this. It is a well-known fact that a creative genius need not invent everything himself, otherwise Shakespeare would not be one. Curiously some of the great creative artists owe so much to others that indiscriminating readers are prone to consider them as nothing very great. A creative artist's originality lies in the way in which he handles the matter which he has borrowed or assimilated from others. An artist takes an old story and puts much that is new into it and gives it a new life. The author might be a translator; but what if the translation is a work with a force, vigour, and beauty that the original does not possess?

What are these *Purāṇas*? At least the most important amongst them were the productions of mighty creative geniuses who were seers. They had an ideal of life, the Brahmanical in this instance, and they gave expression to it in this work in such a way that they appealed to the largest number of men in the country. They were never written after the models of the abstruse treatises which were intended for the highly cultured. The works were mostly propagandist in their purpose. These great geniuses had such a practical turn of mind that their propaganda, carried

on ages ago, would compare very favourably with the propaganda carried on by some of the Christian societies in the world to-day. The thoroughness and the extensiveness with which they carried on their work explains to some extent the permanence with which their ideal has struck deep into the minds of the Hindus.

The chief learned Brāhmaṇa works are abstruse treatises in Sanskrit on philosophy, religion and religious ritual. They were not for the masses. If the heterogeneous mass had to be led and kept under the control of the Brāhmaṇa who stood for its most entrancing and beautiful ideal of life, works which appeal most to the mass mind, moving it powerfully, must be constructed. Hence those *Puraṇas* and *Upapurāṇas*. So also those many great concessions made to the masses in regard to religious matters, for instance that the mere repetition of Viṣṇu's name is meritorious, as also the great efficacy of *Tulasidalam* and Ganges water. Brahmanical religion is the religion for the few; when it is to be applied to the masses, some powerful instruments for its spread have to be constructed. The subtle Brāhmaṇa found one such instrument in the aristocracy of the land. But the Brāhmaṇa knew that it was at best a transitory and a weak instrument. Another was his own powerful intellect. He became a literary artist and he began to capture men's minds. He did capture men's minds and the most powerful weapons in his armoury were these popular works, the *Purāṇas*.

These popular works bear distinct marks of the purpose with which they were written. No abstractions, no vague general principles hard to be understood. no abstruse philosophical discussion, but concrete stories told with a force and beauty hardly surpassed in any literature. Their purpose was not to construct a small work faultless in every detail but difficult to be understood, for that would have spelt ruin to their purpose. A huge edifice imposing in its appearance and powerfully moving all minds in its total effect, the

general effect must be great, if the Brāhmaṇas were to succeed.

The planning and execution of these great works show the comprehensive intellect of the Brāhmaṇa. As nothing is wholly good so also our Brāhmaṇa's propaganda had its great evils. As it appears to us the great energy of the Brāhmaṇa was almost spent in the propaganda itself. Very little was left for further development. Progress was arrested and stagnation was one of its most serious consequences.

Reverting to our subject, these *Purāṇas* offered good ground for utilising the energy of a rising poet. There was the outline; and there was scope for great improvement in detail where the highest ability could find adequate employment.

Buddhism challenged successfully for some time the Brahmanical ideal and showed that it was not the only ideal. The Buddhist was no match to the Brāhmaṇa in India and the former mistook the temporary effect for the permanent. The Buddhist did not count the tremendous effect of the Brāhmaṇa propaganda on the side of his adversaries. Śankara and Rāmānuja moved the learned and cultured and used, if tradition tells truth, the merciless sword of the new-convert kings in overcoming the masses and reclaiming them to the Hindu fold. The Brahmanical ideal, which was so gloriously fresh in men's minds once, had become a little faded. It had to be revived. Hence these translations of the *Purāṇas*, but not of the innumerable other works on religion and religious ritual.

Coming to the subject of our essay we find Potanna a great *bhakta* and a poet. He must sing, and his great spirit could not be kept in without pouring forth its riches liberally for his fellow beings. He does not touch upon the vast mass but selects for his treatment a few which give scope for the employment of his great powers. How well he did his work can be seen by a comparison of the translation with the original. Potanna's art as it appears in some of his best pieces would be discussed later on.

Some, then, may think that after all in these days when the ideal, which forms the basis of the work, has been challenged successfully by a new onrush of ideas and has been almost swept away from modern Hindu life, the work which is based upon it becomes itself unconvincing. But such forget that even though the Brahmanical ideal has now become a splendid illusion of the past, yet its influence has not been lost upon the country. Even if it were swept away yet the picture, once the only one that held sway over the gifted of this land, has so much in it to guide us in this period of transition, when we are moving towards a goal which is not even vaguely discernible to our sight, that a hasty dismissal of it without closer study would cause the greatest danger to our society. Even granting that we will depart farther and farther away from this ideal, finally breaking all our connection with it, yet the books, at least some portions of them, will go on influencing the people, as they are works of literature. So long as poetry will go on influencing men, so long will these works influence us.

It is a fact of everyday observation that men and women who lay no claim to any learning read it still with absorption as well as the learned. What then are the merits of the work which moves so strongly unsophisticated minds? What are the qualities of the poet which impress such enduring qualities upon the work?

First and foremost is his sincerity, the matchless sincerity of the poet. He is not the occasional singer for men in their easy chairs. His is not the function to merely tickle one's fancy, to be forgotten as soon as the pleasing sensation is lost. His purpose is serious and he carries with him men's souls as he pours forth in torrents his *bhakti* to the Almighty. He is never equivocal or vague, but he always surely and powerfully hits the mark. He is not the man to take sides for Viṣṇu or Brahmā or Śiva; they are to him, as to all true devotees, only manifestations of the

One Supreme Being. The universe is the garb which He has woven about Himself, it may be for His pleasure. Wherever we go, we see Him, we feel Him. He is all-pervading and ever-present. Is it the maniac Hiraṇyakaśipu that in blind fury strikes the stately pillar demanding his son to show him the Supreme there? Yes, He is there sure as fate.

"Do not entertain the doubt that He is here and that He is not there; Viṣṇu is found wherever you seek for Him. Oh, thou great amongst Rākṣasas, dost thou see?"

How to see Him and how to reach Him? It is not by knowledge, it is by *bhakti.*

"You cannot cross the ocean of life without the help of the ship of your *bhakti* for Viṣṇu."

"One who does not worship Śiva with all the strength of his hands, who does not praise Viṣṇu till his mouth aches and does not possess in his heart kindness and truth, why should he be born except to cause harm to the womb of his mother."

Yes, there he is. The Poet does not want to please anybody with weak condemnation and thus damn his own argument. *Bhakti* of the purest form with charity and truth gives salvation to the soul of man. This is the supreme truth.

"Without the slightest insincerity and hypocrisy entertaining always *bhakti* for the Supreme, if a man enjoy the sweet scent arising out of the divine lotus feet of Viṣṇu, he knows the great and wonderful mysterious ways of Viṣṇu which are not grasped easily even by Gods like Brahmā."

"Viṣṇu is Universe and there is nothing other than Viṣṇu in the Universe."

"Always Acyuta exists like a small something of resplendent radiance in the hearts of all living beings."

"Words of worship of Viṣṇu are givers of prosperity, destroyers of sorrows, powerful lights in the thick darkness of sin and hard to be refuted by the atheists."

"The acts of worship of the feet of Vāsudeva are purifiers (from sin) of the creepers of evil, life-givers of perpetual supreme good, givers and securers of prosperity."

Gajendra, when his leg was caught by the crocodile, first exerts his force and tries his best to extricate it from its vicious mouth. When he fails to do it he begins to pray to all the Deities of Heaven to save him. None come to his rescue. His faith begins to waver, but as Gajendra is becoming weaker and weaker he cries to the Almighty to save him. Some of the verses in which Gajendra sends out his prayer to the Almighty are exquisite and one of them is given below:—

"I beg Him to save me, who is the cause of the Universe, in whom it lies hidden and in whom it is absorbed; who is the God of gods, who is the prime cause of all; who has neither beginning, nor middle, nor end, who is everything and who is self-born."

He comes the Saviour of all. Nay, in a thousand places and in a thousand forms He preaches to frail man, His brother, to pursue the *bhaktimārga* which alone gives salvation to man.

This sincerity was indeed very rare in his age. Amongst the poets of that age and perhaps amongst all the Telugu poets he is one who stands out pre-eminent for his sincerity. Most Telugu poets have very seriously failed in creating their imaginative worlds.

For instance in the *Prabandhas* there is very little to satisfy the yearning soul of man. Their structures are "airy nothings" which fail to take shape in the imagination of the readers. The light love dealt with therein, and the sensuous descriptions of beauty which are contained in them fail to make us happy. They appear to revel in beauty but that beauty is "of the earth, earthy" and there is nothing divine about it.

Ignorant as we are of the state of religious feeling at that time, we cannot with any definiteness say that the man was

called forth by the times. Whatever it might be we find him coming at that period seemingly as if to revive man's faith in the supreme. His is not the method of that cautious bishop who said, "If there be a God, let Him save my soul, if I have a soul?" His is the unwavering faith of the strong and deeply religious. His is the robust faith which is so wholesome and soothing to men's souls. It gushes out and wells forth in a thousand places and on all occasions. It colours his whole work and forms its very foundation. It is this which forces him to dedicate it to the Supreme Being, ignoring alike the tempting offers or ferocious threats of tyrant monarchs. It is this which sustains him in hard and crushing difficulties, and aids him to finish his work. Because he was such a fervent *bhakta* he could so gloriously paint the picture of Prahlāda, who was—

"A boy of resplendent refulgence who was strongly desirous of the task of concentrating his thought upon the lotus feet of Viṣṇu, who is of a very kind disposition, who bent his forehead to the feet of virtuous men and teachers, who was a possessor of pure grace and who possessed qualities which elicited the praise of all good people."

"Prahlāda of fine fame was one who looked at all other living things with as much friendliness as he would at himself, who like a servant would respect and honour his elders when he saw them, who when he saw other women would behave as he would towards his own mother and turn away; who in love of charity would think of protecting the poor and the weak as parents would do their children, who was like a brother to his friends, who would treat his teachers like Gods and who would not even in play utter an untruth."

"If he fancied that Viṣṇu came to him he would forget to go to any of his friends; if he imagined that the Enemy of Rākṣasas (Viṣṇu) played before him he forgot to play with Rākṣasa boys; if he fancied that the Friend of His devotees talked o him he would forget to reply

to those who were talking to him; if he imagined that he saw Viṣṇu in his own mind, overcome with that beatific vision, he would forget to see anything; if he felt his heart full of the nectar of meditation of the lotus feet of Viṣṇu, completely contented, forgetting everything, he would behave like a stupid man though he was not stupid.

"In drinking, eating, talking, smiling or sleeping, walking or seeing always deeply employed in enjoying the nectar of contemplation of the fair lotus feet of Śrī Nārāyaṇa, the son of the enemy of Gods (Prahlāda) forgot this universe, O King!"

Seldom has he been surpassed by any poet in composing verses surcharged with fervent *bhakti* and he finds his equals in Tulsīdās and Sūrdas. In this connection we cannot do better than mention another great Andhra *bhakta* poet, the Mozart of the Andhra Dēśā, Tyāgarāja of Tanjore, whose many songs are the favourites of Telugu musicians and the Telugu public and which in their melody and sweetness have never been surpassed in Southern India. He has never been studied by the student of Telugu, for his compositions do not come under those recognised by canons of literary art contained in Telugu translations of Sanskrit works on rhetoric and prosody. But if poetry be not limited to the narrow circle of works written in accordance with rules given and recognised by text books on rhetoric, we may affirm that he is one of the greatest of Telugu poets.

No poet could be great without high seriousness as Matthew Arnold remarks. It is the touchstone upon which the quality of a poet's work can be tested. Arnold's criticism does not apply to the poets of certain ages only. It belongs to great poets of all ages and of all climes. It is only in the degree in which a poet possesses it that he is great. Define it, our critic may ask? Oh Critic! do you not see the rose? We ask you to define it. You will define it by counting the number of petals, by naming its colour and so on. When all

your rigmarole has been gone through, you will find that you have not advanced at all in your elucidation. And still there is the rose which you feel and enjoy. You feel this quality of high seriousness in every great poet; you feel it and it sinks into your soul. It sinks into your soul and it elevates you as "things which are beautiful, as things which are of good import" alone can do. It pervades his best work, to which mostly we confine our attention in the succeeding pages.

We must notice his power of painting word pictures, vividly and beautifully. He possessed a powerful imagination and in a masterly manner he conveys to the written page his wonderful creations. In many places whole verses are pictures exquisitely painted which strike your mind and for ever stick there. Is it Hiraṇyakaśipu searching for Viṣṇu? There you find this Prometheus rushing on through space and searching all worlds, but missing Him everywhere, for he missed the true place where alone he could meet Him, namely, his own heart. Is it Prahlāda his great son sweetly defying his father to practise upon his tender limbs the tortures that the most devilish nature could invent rather than give up *Haribhajana*? There you find our author swiftly and surely sketching in words a picture which strikes our minds clearly and beautifully. Is it Gajendra fighting with the crocodile? Is it Vāmana preparing for the final overthrow of Bali the noble Rākṣasa Emperor, the worthy grandson of Prahlāda? There is his ever active and powerful imagination guiding a pen more powerful than the brush of the most finished painter. His power of painting word-pictures has never been surpassed and he claims fellowship with the best of all ages.

Let us notice a few such word-pictures which are extremely beautiful and which at the same time illustrate what we have said above. One of the most famous is this:

"There in that famous Vaikuṇṭha in the divine palace, in his chief mansion in the garden of Mandāra trees by the

shores of the lake of nectar on a couch of lotuses playing with Lakṣmī, the God who always goes to the rescue of the suffering persons, hearing the cry—'save me,' 'save me,' of the much suffering elephant king became suddenly very agitated."

How beautiful is this! And though we may not believe in a single object enumerated in it, we seem to see the picture in our mental eye as clear as any painted in colours on a canvas.

The following verse is no less beautiful:

"He would not tell Lakṣmi (where He was going); He would take in His hands neither the conch nor the disc; He would not summon any of His followers; He would not think of the prince of birds (Garuḍa); He would not arrange His braided hair which has got through His earrings; so bent was He upon saving the life of the elephant; He would not even let go the border of the garment worn by Lakṣmī who was engaged in hot discussion with Him."

And upon this there hangs a tale.

Śrīnātha, when on a visit to our poet, remarked, it seems, that the verse contained things which nowhere could be found and which were absurd. Then Potanna, as tradition says, hid Śrīnātha's son somewhere near the well in his garden, threw a big stone into it calling out to Śrīnātha to save his son who has fallen into the well. Śrīnātha ran to the spot and stood there bewildered doing nothing but crying "Save my son, save my son." Then Potanna said, "Why do you stand here like a moonstruck being? Why do you not run for a rope or a ladder? Śrīnātha was completely paralysed out of action. Then Potanna said, "Come on; your son is safe here hidden by me. Do you realise even now the truth of my verse?"

The characters which figure in his translation live vitally and they are sure to be remembered for ever. He has left the richest of legacies which a man can leave to the people coming after him, namely, ideals like Prahlāda, Gajendra,

the mighty elephaht king, first strong in his physical powers but weak in his faith, then weak as a new-born baby but strong in his conquered doubt; Bali massive in his truthfulness, preferring death rather than facing the world after retracting a promise; Kuchela the poor, lean, and learned Brāhmaṇa modest and afraid of kingly courts; Vāmana, the *Avatāra* of Viṣṇu, preparing for the overthrow of Bali and a host of others have been virtually created for the Andhras; and they are as much the peculiar and sole possession of the Telugu as any other literary characters which has been borrowed only.

It is this essentially poetic quality, viz., concretisation that demands a little further notice at our hands. In our author's outbursts of fervent *bhakti* we find concrete pictures which stick to our minds filling them with their intense beauty. Nowhere would he care to deal in vague and abstract terms but with his insight he rapidly paints pictures in every line. The poet has gone but there are the pictures struck deep into the readers' minds.

"Does the bee which floats in the honey of Mandāra flowers go to Madana[1] flowers? Does the royal swan swimming in the pure waters of the Heavenly Ganges, go to the ordinary rivers? Does the cuckoo eating the tender red sprigs of the mango tree and immensely delighted with it, go to Kuṭaja trees? Does the Chakora quivering with delight at the full moon's light, care to go to thick mists? How can the mind highly intoxicated with the drinking of the nectar of contemplation of the lotus feet of Viṣṇu go to others, O man of praiseworthy qualities and disposition?"

"Is that body, which is not devoted to Viṣṇu, really a body or a mere bladder of skin inflated with air? Is that mouth, which does not praise Viṣṇu a mouth or a drum producing harsh sounds? Is that hand, which does not perform the worship of Viṣṇu, a hand but a ladle made of

[1] The *Dhatura* flower.

wood? Are those eyes, which have not seen Viṣṇu, eyes or small holes in the walls of the body? Is that life, which does not think of Viṣṇu, life or a tremulous bubble in water? Is that man, who has no faith in Viṣṇu, a man or a brute on two legs?"

"The useless lives of those who are devoid of faith in the Supreme, are like moonrise to the blind, the playing on conches to the stone deaf; the reading of good books to mutes; the desire for women to impotent men; the relationship with men without gratitude; the sacrificial *ghī* poured into mud; the money to misers; and sweet scents to the pigs."

It is not possible to exhaust the beauties of a huge work like this when there are so many, and such a thing would weary our readers. Leaving many unnoticed, we will notice a few.

The conversation between Bali and Vāmana where the mighty emperor unwillingly admires the powers and comments upon the modesty of the boon begged by the Brāhmaṇa *Brahmacāri* raises in us a smile of pity for Bali's innocence. There is a tenderness and a dignity with which Bali deals with Vāmana which moves us strongly. The equivocal answers of Vāmana are very pleasing though they give rise to feelings of strong sympathy for the great Rākṣasa Emperor. Bali's promise of three steps was made and the gift ceremony was about to be performed when Śukrācārya exposes the disguise of Vāmana. But the noble words in which this Rākṣasa Emperor chides his Brāhmaṇa preceptor are so noble that our sympathies are on the side of Bali who was about to receive the last blow which overthrows him.

Śukra says:—"Oh! thou great emperor, recant your promise of gift, for this dwarf Vāmana is Viṣṇu himself. He would fill the Universe with His Person and then who could stop the harm which would happen to you."

Then Bali replies:—

"You have rightly advised me, Great One, and that is the *dharma* of householders. I have proclaimed that I

would give any of these, viz., money, things, desires, fame (that which makes you famous) on being begged. How in cupidity to send away a man who has begged for money? What greater sin is there than denying what you have said? Did not the goddess of earth tell Brahmā that she could bear any sinner but not a liar? Is there anything better to men of honour than death on a battlefield without retreat or acting truthfully without denying what was said?

"Were there not kings? Had they not kingdoms? Did they not rise to proud positions? Where are they now? Were they able to take their wealth with them? Have they even left names here on earth? Śibi and other famous kings desirous of fame, did they not give gifts in their time? Have they been forgotten now, O Bhārgava!"

"The hand, that was first shown a new propriety as it touches Lakṣmī's head, then Her body, then the garment worn over Her shoulders, then Her Lotus feet, then Her cheeks, then Her breasts, that such a Divine Hand to be below mine (for it is begging) and mine to be above, is it not good? Is it not glorious? Would my empire last for ever and would my body last (for ever) without decay."

Śukra's mouth was effectively stopped by the royal chiding but Śukra's devotion to his disciple is very touching particularly when we reflect upon the sad results which it produced.

The boy *bhakta* Prahlāda moving in his own splendid spiritual world careless either of the kingly court or of his father's cruel punishment for his heresy and treachery against him, his indifference to what he considers the useless studies so strenuously thrust upon him by his loving father all these are very beautiful and are expressed in noble verses which fascinate all who study them.

Gajendra's cry for mercy when he was on the point of fainting, the haste with which Viṣṇu leaving his resting place in high Heaven rushes to his help, have ever been considered to be some of the best among Potanna's verses.

Kuchela's journey to the court of Srī Krishna, his reception there, their conversation and their recollections of their childhood and fellow studentship and his final gift to the Lord, have all been expressed in exquisite verses.

The verses in which Draupadī bewails the loss of her sons, and the wailing of the male bird when his mate was killed by a hunter are very pathetic. They indicate the way in which the master hand of Potanna could deal with pathos.

It remains for me to say a few words about the style and language of Potanamatya. I would merely mention that some rhetoricians have taken objection to some of his practices in metre and grammar but we may say that they are so unimportant that we may dismiss them at once from our minds without any comment.

We must constantly bear in mind that Potanna was translating a *Purāṇa* from Sanskrit. Poets who had translated before him the *Bhāratam* into Telugu had set him an example which he could not ignore. The Brahman poet Nannaya considered till recently the first [1] Andhra poet and certainly the father of Telugu poetry was a lover of Sanskrit and his love for it was as great at least, if not greater than that for Telugu. Yerrapragada follows his example in a way. But Tikkanamatya with his towering genius who is considered to be the greatest of Andhra poets has maintained a balance between Sanskrit and Telugu which was seldom maintained by any of his great successors. Bearing in mind these facts and the observations which we have made in an earlier part of this essay we should not be surprised if we find Potanna more Sanskritic than we wish him to be.

He says in the beginning of his work :—

"Some relish Telugu greatly and others Sanskrit and yet others love both equally. I will please all by using both (appropriately in their place)."

[1] It was always doubted by learned Andhra scholars whether Nannaya could ever be the first Andhra poet. But it has been shown definitely some years back that he is not the first Telugu poet known to us.

This shows us that the Andhras then also were considering about the legitimate place which Sanskrit should occupy in Telugu vocabulary. But seeing in this case, how largely religious and philosophical matters crop up in the work we cannot blame Potanna if he showed greater partiality to Sanskrit than to Telugu in his work. Even apart from this, pure Telugu is so bald that in a translation of a book like *Bhagavatam* it certainly cannot hope to gain a primary place by thrusting Sanskrit aside into the background.

Sanskrit words seem to come to him and out of him more easily and more gracefully than Telugu words. But the force of his expression is nowhere diminished by this very liberal use of Sanskrit, as might have been the case in the hands of a less skilful poet than Potanna. And when we remember the fact of some of his successors revelling in the use of Sanskrit words, which makes their work as artificial as a piece of mosaic, we readily forget Potanna's greater love for Sanskrit as compared to Telugu. Nowhere is there ambiguity and the language is all perspicuous and sweet. The style is elevated and grand ; but in common with all other Telugu poets he possesses a love of jingling which jars upon delicately strung ears. In his work, there are also verses which are surcharged with Sanskrit words and compounds. His prose is barbarous as is the case with most other Telugu poets. But we readily forgive him all this when we remember his powerful and yet very melodious style, the age in which he lived and the gigantic nature of the task, which he so successfully accomplished. Indeed the one feeling that pervades our hearts after a study of his work is one of intense admiration for this great man.

We have come to the end of our task ; on account of exigencies of space and time we have not touched upon various topics connected with our poet such as a discussion of his philosophical system, his interpretation of the original, his relation to some of his great predecessors and to his

successors, etc., and even those points that have been touched upon have been very lightly dealt with, for our purpose was solely to bring him to the notice of a larger audience than he has hitherto enjoyed. There are many difficulties in the way of his becoming as popular as we wish him to be. With the fast disappearance of a state of society and of beliefs which made it popular there is a great danger of his being dismissed with a profound *namaskāram* to the undusted corners of the library shelf. He is a poet who is a teacher and who possesses unlimited veracity and love of what is pure and noble and what is beautiful and elevating, a poet whose life, as far as it is known leaves in our hearts a noble picture of great moral and spiritual value, a poet who shows in himself the best of Andhra character and genius, which always went up to the stately and grand, revelling withal in a sweetness which deserts not even its poetasters, and as such he will take his place with the Immortals shedding light and grace on all those who read him turning their vision to things beautiful and pure.

THE DATE OF ŚRI-CANDRA.

R. D. Banerji, M.A., *Superintendent, Archæological Survey of India, Western Circle, Poona.*

Śrī-Candra of the Candra dynasty of Candradvīpa and Bhojavarmman of the Varmman or Yādava dynasty of Vikramapura are known from one inscription each, *i.e.*, from the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra [1] and the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman,[2] both of which have, recently, been edited in the *Epigraphia Indica* by Mr. Radhagovinda Basak. The Vārendra Research Society of Rajshahi in Bengal has discovered numerous inscriptions both on stone and copper which throws a good deal of new light on the history of Eastern India. The grants mentioned above prove the existence of two new dynasties of kings of Eastern Bengal, one of which was totally and the second practically unknown to us. All students and lovers of Epigraphy and Ancient Indian History ought to be grateful to the Vārendra Research Society and its prominent members for their continued effort in this direction which has certainly enriched the store of our knowledge.

The Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra was discovered by Mr. Basak and is now in the Museum of the Vārendra Research Society at Rajshahi. It has been edited by its discoverer in the *Epigraphia Indica*. The Belava grant of Bhojavarmman was however discovered by another gentleman and is now deposited in the Dacca Museum. It was edited more than once [3] before its publication by Mr. Basak in *Epigraphia Indica*. Both grants however were issued from the royal capital of

[1] *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XII, pp. 138-40.

[2] *Ibid*, pp. 39-41.

[3] *Dacca Review*, Vol. II (1912), No. 4. *J. & P. A. S. B.*, Vol. X, pp. 121-29.

Śrī-Vikramapura and the object of both inscriptions were to record grants of lands in the same district, *i.e.*, the *bhukti* of *Pauṇḍra*. We have had as yet no reason to suppose that the *Śri-Vikramapura-samāvāsita-jayaskandhāvāra* mentioned in both grants referred to two different places. There is also no reason to suppose that this place is different from Vikramapura in the Pauṇḍravardhana *bhuhti* mentioned in the Madanapāḍa grant of Viśvarūpasena,[1] the Edilpur grant of Keśavasena[2] or the Tarpandīghi grant of their father Lakṣmaṇasena.[3] The *bhukti* of Pauṇḍra is also no doubt the same as that mentioned in the Dāmodarapur grants of Kumāragupta and Budhagupta[4] and in the Bāngarh grant of Mahīpāla I,[5] the Amgāchi grant of Vigrahapāla III,[6] and the Manahali grant of Madanapāla.[7] The same name is to be found in the Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena[8] and the Mādhāinagar[9] and Ānulia[10] grants of Lakṣmaṇasena. We have therefore in the Rampal and Belava grants conditions which are very favourable to a palæographical enquiry. Both inscriptions are incised on copper and record grants of land in the same district or *bhukti*, both grants were issued from the same place, while the findspots of both plates lie in the same district, the distance between both probably not exceeding one hundred miles.

While editing the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman, Mr. Basak says "the inscription is written in Northern characters of the eleventh century, A.D."[11] but about the Rampal grant of Srī-Candra Mr. Basak states that "the characters of the inscription belong to a variety of alphabets used in the eastern

[1] *J. A. S. B.* (old series 1896), Part I, p. 13.
[2] *J. & P. A. S. B.* (new series), Vol. X (1914), 103.
[3] *Epi. Ind.*, Vol. XII, p. 9.
[4] *Ibid*, Vol. XV, pp. 113-45.
[5] *Ibid*, Vol. XIV, p. 327.
[6] *Ibid*, Vol. XV, p. 295.
[7] *J.A.S.B.* (old series), 1900, Part I, p. 71.
[8] *Epi. Ind.*, Vol. XV, p. 283.
[9] *J. & P.A.S.B.* (new series), Vol. V, p. 474.
[10] *J.A.S.B.*, 1900, Part I, p. 64.
[11] *Epi. Ind.*, Vol. XII, p. 37.

part of Northern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries." [1] A comparison of these statements shows that Mr. Basak considers the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra to be slightly later in date than the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman. None of these two grants bear dates in any era. The Belava grant is dated in the year 5 of the reign of Bhojavarmman but the Rampal grant omits even the regnal year of Srī-Candra. The positions of these two records in the chronological scale can therefore be determined only by a detailed palæographical examination.

Let us, in the first place compare the characters of the Belava grant with those of the Rampal grant in order to find out which inscription is older. Among vowels *a*, *ā*, and *u* are to be found in both inscriptions. Only one type of *a* is used throughout the Rampal grant.

This is the proto-Bengali type which consists of a horizontal line, from the right end of which a vertical straight line, slightly longer than the horizontal line in length, is drawn downwards. From the left end of the horizontal line a tangential stroke runs downwards to the right, thus forming an acute angle with the horizontal line. From the right end of this tangent hangs a comma-shaped stroke, which differentiates the proto-Bengali type of *a* and its derivative the initial *ā*. Now, a slightly curved line joins this comma-shaped line to the lower end of the vertical straight line at the bottom of the letter. Finally we have a little arrow-head or an extremely small solid triangle at the lower end of the vertical straight line. Compare the forms of *a* in *arccanam* (ll. 4-5); *avāpa* (l. 12); *a-cāṭabhaṭa* l. 25); *a-kiñcit* (l. 26). Coming to the Belava grant we find that we have two different forms of *a*. In these two forms the vertical and horizontal straight lines, the comma and the line connecting the comma with the lower end of the vertical straight line are present, but the line joining the left end of the horizontal straight line with

[1] *Ibid*, p. 137.

the comma has partly disappeared and the arrow head or the little solid traingle at the lower end of the vertical line has changed its shape. The *differentia* between the two forms of this vowel in the Belava grant consists in the form of this pendant to the vertical line. In form (*a*) the triangle has widened and is in fact an equilateral rather than an isosceles triangle and it is no longer solid. But in form (*b*) the appendage has ceased to be a triangle as its apex has opened. This opening has caused one of the sides of the triangle to coalesce with the curved line which joins the comma-shaped curve with the lower end of the vertical straight line. Examples of form (*a*) may be found in *abhavad* (l. 10), *antaraṅga* (l. 31) and *ahani* (l. 46) while examples of form (*b*) are to be found in *arghaḥ* (l. 6), *adhaḥpattana*, *aṣṭa gaccha* (l. 27), *anyāṁśca* (l. 34), *a-cāḍabhaḍa* and *a-kiñcit* (l. 40).

Similarly in the case of *ā*, which is but a derivative form of *a*, we find the arrow head or the solid triangle at the lower extremity of the vertical straight line in the form used in the Rampal grant; cf. *ādhāro* (l. 9) and *ākṣeptā* (l. 36).

In both of these cases the line joining the left end of the horizontal straight line is present. But in the case of the Belava grant we find that this line has partly disappeared and we have two different forms as in the case of *a*, according to the change in the form of the appendage to the lower end of the left vertical line. Form (*a*), where we find a triangle which is no longer solid, is to be found in *ā-candrārkaṁ* (l. 47) while form (*b*), where the appendage has ceased to be a triangle on account of the opening of the apex, is to be found in the *āsīt* (ll. 20-21) and *āpnavān* (l. 41).

Only one form of the initial short *i* is to be found in the Rampal grant which consists of an arrow-head on the top with two small circles, side by side, below it; cf. *it-īva* (l. 6); *iti* (ll. 34 and 38). The form used in the Belava grant is slightly different. In this form a small curved horizontal stroke

has been added just below the space between the two circles, cf. *iva* (l. 11); *iva* (l. 12); *iti* (l, 23) and *iha* (l. 95).

The initial form of no other vowel is present in both grants so we may begin with the consonants. Remarkable difference in forms is not to be found in the letters of the first two *vargas*. In *ṭa* the difference lies in the length of the straight vertical line which drops downwards from the right end of the short horizontal line at the top. In the Rampal grant this is the form in all cases. But this vertical line to the left has almost disappeared in the Belava grant, cf. *pūṭaka* (l. 29), *mahākṣapaṭalika* (ll. 31-32) and *caṭṭa bhaṭṭa* (l. 35).

The very rare *ṭha* occurs twice in the same line in the Rampal grant. The form is the time-honoured one of the Maurya inscriptions, *i.e.* perfectly round, cf. *pīṭhikāsu* and *paṭhitaḥ* (l. 5). But the form of this consonant in the Belava grant is quite different. Here for the first time in the history of the evolution of this letter its form is not a perfect circle. Rather it is now ellipsoid in shape which is significant, cf. *pīṭhikāvitta* (l. 30).

In *ta*, which is of the late Nāgarī form, we find very little change. In both grants the right vertical line of this grant has become a perfect straight line. In one or two cases only the later or Bengali form occurs in the Belava grant, cf. *tataḥ* (l. 4); *ikshatu* (l. 5) and *tasya* (l. 20).

Greater divergence of forms is noticeable in *tha*. In the Rampal grant we have two different forms; (*a*) the Nāgarī form in which the loop in the upper part of the letter opens very slightly at the top, with a distinct *serif* on the left upper limb; cf. *atithibhis* (l. 9); but in two other cases we have the proto-Bengali form, cf. *yathārhaṁ* (l. 22) and *yathā* (l. 23) but in both of these cases we have a long straight line as the top stroke. In these forms we find that distinguishing feature of proto-Bengali type, which is the opening of the lower part of the upper loop, but in both of

the examples cited above the opening is hardly perceptible. In comparison with these forms the form used in the Belava grant is very late. The upper loop has ceased to exist and the long top stroke entirely disappeared, cf. *atha* (l. 10); *pṛithu* and *prathayan* (l. 13); *prathama* (l. 16); *yathā* (ll. 36 and 37). In another case the form of this consonant is still later, cf. *gāthābhih* (l. 23). In this case not only the upper circle or loop has ceased to exist but the lower loop has also opened at the top thus making the evolution of the Bengali form complete.

There is a good deal of difference in *da*. The form used in the Rampal grant in all cases is a peculiar one in which there is a curved projection upwards in the back of the letter which is always absent in the form used in the Belava grant in all cases.

Considerable difference of form is also noticeable in *dha*, which in the Rampal grant consists of the ancient Gupta form with the apex slightly opened but which in the Belava grant resembles the modern Bengali forms almost completely. Here the curved line on the left has a straight line on its top running tangentially to the proper left. In some cases the opening of the apex of the letter is visible such as the form in *adhaḥpattana* (l. 27) but in some cases there is no opening at all, e.g., *sutradhāraḥ* (l. 6). This form is the complete modern Bengali form with the exception of one detail which is the angularisation of the curve at the back of this letter.

In *na*, in all cases, the line which joins the loop or circle in the left lower part of the letter with the vertical straight line on the right is not long or distinct, in the case of the Rampal grant but in the case of the Belava grant this line is a distinct curve, longer in comparison with that in the forms used in the Rampal grant.

In the whole of the *pa-varga* noticeable change is to be found in the last letter *ma*. The principal difference between this form and the later Gupta form lies in the shortening of

the breadth of the letter, thus making the acute angle at the bottom more prolonged.

The sharp upward projection on the back, which is noticeable in the case of *da*, is also to be found in all cases of *ya* in the Rampal grant. But in the case of the Belava grant this projection on the back is altogether absent.

The form of *ra* used in the Rampal grant is the archaic one with the solid wedge or arrow head at the lower end of the vertical straight line but the form used in the Belava grant is much later. In the latter case the wedge is no longer solid and it has widened at the top, thus becoming a triangle in the lower part of the letter.

Two different varieties of the palatal sibilant are to be found in the Rampal grant. Variety (*a*) is the looped form which occurs in the majority of cases ; cf. *viśāla* (l. 4) and the other, type (*b*), is the later form invariably used in all eleventh and twelfth century records in north-eastern India, cf. *vaṁśe* (l. 4). One important detail has to be noted in this connection. Out of all clear and legible instances of the occurrence of the palatal sibilant in this grant, the later form has been used in ten or eleven instances only, cf. *vaṁśe* (l. 3) ; *śriyāṁ* (l. 4) ; *aṅśuḥ* (l. 6) ; *āśaye* and *diśāṁ* (l. 9) ; *yaś* and *śriyām* (l. 10) ; *śrīḥ* (l. 11) ; *śubhe* (l. 12) ; and *diśāṁ* (l. 14). In all other cases the looped form of *śa* has been used. The facsimile of the reverse of the Rampal grant, which is reproduced in the *Epigraphia Indica*, is not distinct ; but so far as the facsimile is legible, the later form of *śa* does not appear to have been used at all, after the fourteenth line of the grant. *Śa* of the second type is used in almost all cases in the Belava grant.

Only one form of the medial sibilant has been used throughout the Rampal grant. In this form we find that the breadth of the upper part of the letter is less than that of the lower part and there is no acute angle in its lower extremity, where the right and left limbs of the letter join. In the

form used in the Belava grant we find that the breadth of the upper and lower halves are equal and there is a well-formed acute angle in the lower part of the consonant.

A difference in the width of the upper and lower part of the dental sibilant is also noticeable in the Rampal grant but in the forms used in the Belava grant the lower part is much more wide in comparison with the upper.

In the case of the aspirate we find that two different forms were used in the Rampal grant. The first of these types (*a*) shows a very well-formed acute angle in the lower part and a broad curved back in the place of the upper angle, cf. *mahiṣa* (l. 20). In the second form we find that the curve in the back is more pronounced, the acute angle at the bottom on the left has disappeared and its place is taken by a short vertical pendant to the curve, cf. *mahāsarvvādhikṛta* (l. 19). This is the form used in the Belava grant. In the Rampal grant form (*b*) predominates over form (*a*) as in the obverse out of thirty-one cases we find that form (*a*) has been used in thirteen cases only and form (*b*) in the rest.

Let us now compare the alphabets used in the Rampal and Belava grants with those of some other copper plate grants discovered in Bengal in order to determine their age. Unfortunately for us very few copper plate grants found in Bengal are dated in any known era and consequently we are obliged to fall back upon inscriptions the dates of which are known only with some degree of certainty. Let us take for example the Bangarh grant of Mahīpāla I, which was discovered in Bengal proper and which recorded the grant of some village in the Pauṇḍravarddhana *bhukti* which is the Pauṇḍra *bhukti* of the Rampal grant as the upper limit and the Tarpandighi grant of Lakṣmaṇasena which also was discovered in Bengal proper, recorded a grant of land in the Pauṇḍravardhana *bhukti* and was moreover issued from the victorious camp of Vikramapura whence the Rampal and Belava grants were issued, as the lower limit. The dates

of both of these grants are certain within a fixed limit. Thus we know from the Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Cola I that he was a contemporary of Mahīpāla I. and we know from the Sārnāth image inscription of V. S. 1083=1026 A.D. that Mahīpala I lived in the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. Then again, there may still be some difference of opinion about the date of Lakṣmaṇasena but I think nobody would deny that Lakṣmaṇasena, son of Ballālasena was alive and ruled in the twelfth century A.D. The difference of opinion in this case lies in the selection of the particular decade of the twelfth century when Lakṣmaṇasena began to reign.

A general comparison of the alphabets used in these four inscriptions shows that the alphabet of the Rampal grant is more closely allied to that of the Bangarh grant and that of the Belava grant to that of Tarpandighi. Turning to details we find that :—

(1) In the case of initial forms of *a* and *ā*, type (*b*) of the Belava grant has invariably been used in the Bangarh as well as the Tarpandighi grants. In the case of the Bangarh grant we find that in all cases of *a* and *ā*, type (*b*) has been used e.g., *aṅgarakṣa* (l. 36) ; *abhitvaramāṇa* (l. 40) ; *achāṭa* (l. 44); *akiñchid* (l. 45); *āchandra* (l. 46); *ato* (l. 50); *apaharaṇe* (l. 51); *ājñā* (l. 52); *ākṣeptā* (l. 57). As the form of *a* and *ā* used in the Rampal grant is not to be found in the Bangarh grant and later inscriptions we must seek for them in inscriptions of an earlier period. Here we are faced with another difficulty. No inscriptions on copper plates, the date of which is either perfectly or imperfectly known, which record a grant of land in the Pauṇḍra *bhukti* and which can be definitely assigned to the period before the reign of Mahīpāla I have been discovered in Eastern Bengal. In the absence of such records we have to fall back upon the Bhagalpur grant of Mahīpāla's ancestor Nārāyaṇapāla. This grant was discovered almost on the border of Bengal proper and we find that here

in all cases the forms of *a* and *ā* are exactly similar to those used in the Rampal grant, cf. *āripsyante* (l. 18); *anala* (l. 22); *abhitvaromāṇa* (l. 35); *aṇyāṁśca* (l. 36); *anavadya* (l. 40); *achāṭa* (l. 42); *akiñchit* (l. 42); *ākṣeptā* (l. 48).

The primitive *i* of the Rampal grant is not to be found in the Bangarh grant, where the small curved horizontal line noticeable in the lower part of the form used in the Belava grant is to be found in all instances. The form of the Rampal grant is however used in all cases in the Bhagalpur grant, cf. *iti* (l. 47); *iti* (l. 50); *idam* (l. 53).

The form of *ṭa* which we find in all cases in the Rampal grant is not to be met with in any case either in the Bangarh grant of Mahīpala or the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla but it is used in all cases in the Khalimpur grant of Dharmmapāla, cf. *Vapyaṭa* (l. 6).

In the case of *tha* form (*a*) or the Nāgarī form is used in all cases in the Bangarh grant. Form (*b*) is altogether absent. The peculiar hunchbacked *da* of the Rampal grant is altogether absent in previous inscriptions but the angle in the back is present in all cases in the Bangarh grant.

The form of *dha* used in the Rampal grant is also to be found in earlier inscriptions. The Bangarh grant shows a type in which the upper part has not opened as yet. The opening of the apex is noticeable in some cases only in the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla, cf. *sandadhānaḥ* (l. 2) *Srī-Dharmmapāla* (l. 7). Besides the Bhagalpur grant no other copper plate grant but the Rampal one shows the use of this form *dha*.

The curved projection in the back of *ya* is noticeable only in the Rampal grant. A similar projection is to be found on the back of *cha* and *da*. The form of *ra* used in the Rampal grant is used exclusively in the Bangarh grant of Mahīpāla I, the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and even the Khalimpur grant of Dharmmapāla.

Type (*a*) of the palatal *śa* used in the Rampal grant is not to be found in any case in the Bangarh grant where type (*b*) is used in all cases. Type (*a*) however is used exclusively in the Bhagalpur grant of Narāyaṇapāla as well as in the Khalimpur grant of Dharmmapāla.

The form of the medial *ṣa* used in the Rampal grant is not to be found in the Bangarh grant, cf. *sagarttoṣaraḥ* (l. 44). The same word occurs in the Rampal grant (l. 25) and here the medial *ṣa* is slightly wider in the lower than in the upper. The same word occurs in the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla (l. 42) and we find that there is no acute angle at the bottom of this letter which is clearly noticeable in the case of the *ṣa* of the Bangarh grant and that the width of the letter is greater in the lower half than in the upper.

Only form (*a*) of the aspirate used in the Rampal grant is to be found in the Bangarh and earlier grants.

If we turn to the alphabet used in the Tarpandighi grant of Lakṣmaṇasena we find that there is very little affinity between it and the alphahet of the Rampal grant. Forms of *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ṭa*, *tha*, *da*, *dha*, *ya*, *ra*, *śa*, *ṣa* and *ha* are quite different. The general ductus of the script too differs a good deal. The alphabet of the Tarpandighi grant however shows a marked affinity to that of the Belava grant.

All initial forms of *a* and *ā* used in the Tarpandighi grant are similar to type (*b*) of *a* and *ā* used in the Belava grant, cf. *amritātmanaḥ* (l. 5) and *ānanda* (l. 3). The form of the initial *i* also is exactly like that of the Belava grant, cf. *iti* (l. 53). Among consonants the forms of the following letters are similar to those of the Belava grant:—

(1) *ṭa*—cf. *koṭi*; *kirīṭa* (l. 7). (2) *ta*—the later form used in three instances only in the Belava grant, viz. *tataḥ* (l. 4), *ikṣatu* (l. 5) and *tasya* (l. 20) is used in all cases in the Tarpandighi grant. (3) *tha*—the later proto-Bengali form used in the majority of cases in the Belava grant is not used in the Tarpandighi plate but the later Bengali form used

in *gāthābhis* (l. 23) of the Belava grant is used in all cases in the Tarpandighi one. (4) *da*—cf. *samudayanti* (l. 5). (5) *dha*—cf. *indrāyudhaṁ* (l. 1). (6) *ya*—cf. *indrāyudham* (l. 1). (7) *ra*—cf. *nārāyaṇāya* (l. 1). (8) *śa*—cf. *śiromālā* (l. 2). (8) *Ṣa*—cf. *viṣa* (l. 8). (10) *sa*—cf. *sita* (l. 2). (11) *ha*—cf. *nihitaḥ* (l. 2). Later forms of *ha* are used in the Tarpandighi grant side by side with that to be found in the Belava grant, cf. *hata* (l. 4).

The foregoing analysis of the alphabets used in the Bangarh grant of Mahīpāla I, the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra, the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman and the Tarpandighi grant of Lakṣmaṇasena leads us to the following conclusions regarding their proper place in the chronological scale:—

(*a*) That the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman is slightly earlier and the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra very much earlier than the Tarpandighi grant of Lakṣmaṇasena.

(*b*) That the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra is earlier and not later than the Belava grant of Bhojavarmman.

(*c*) That the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra is earlier than the Bangarh grant of Mahīpāla I.

(*d*) That the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra is either contemporary to or very slightly later than the Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and consequently the alphabet used in it cannot be accepted as that "used in the North Eastern India in the eleventh and twelfth centuries." [1]

The date of Bhojavarmman can be fixed independently from the synchronisms of his grand-father Jātavarmman, who was a contemporary of Karṇṇa, king of Dāhala [2] and Divya the Kaivartta king of North Bengal who was vanquished by Rāmapāla.[3] The last decade of the eleventh or the first of the twelfth century A. D. would be the proper period of the Belava grant and this date is quite in agreement with

[1] *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XII, p. 137.

[2] *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V, p. 88.

[3] *Ibid*, Vol. III, p. 15; Vol. V, p. 85.

the deduction of the palæographical analysis that it is slightly earlier than the Tarpandīghi grant of Lakṣmaṇasena. Consequently it is now apparent that the Yādava dynasty of Vikramapura in Eastern Bengal were ousted from their possessions either by Lakṣmaṇasena or any of his two immediate ascendants. The Rampal grant on the other hand proves that three generations of kings of the Candra dynasty ruled in Vikramapura in Eastern Bengal before Mahīpāla I or even before Nārāyaṇapāla. The Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Coḷa I mentions a king of Eastern Bengal named Govinda Candra who was defeated and forced to quit his elephant after his defeat by the former.[1] The evidence of the Rampal grant of Śrī-Candra combined with that of the Tirumalai rock inscription proves that Eastern Bengal was under the rule of the Candra dynasty for more than a century before the time of Mahīpāla I as we have four generations of kings of this dynasty including Govinda Candra. Consequently we can now admit safely that East Bengal was not included in the territories of the Pālas of Bengal in the tenth century A.D. The Candras most probably obtained possession of East Bengal by ousting the Khaḍga dynasty whom we know from the Ashrafpur grants. The previous history of this country is unknown but it is quite possible that Eastern Bengal did not form a part of the Pāla Empire before the days of Mahīpala I.

[1] *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IX, p. 232.

NAWAB SHAIFTA.*

LALA SRI RAM SAHEB, M.A., DELHI.

The nightingale of the boughs of eloquence, the bulbul of the garden of elegance, expert in science and art, the knower of the mysteries of language, an estimable master, the exalted Haji Nawab Mustafa Khan Bahadur, Shaifta, deceased, was a nobleman of Delhi and Jagirdar of Jehangirabad, District Bulandshahar. His father was Nawab Mustuza Khan Muzaffar Jang Azimuddaula Sarfarazul Mulk. Such was his rank in the royal court and thus was he known. In the time of Shah Alam II., he was a Jagirdar of Palwal and other villages. Nawab Mustafa Khan Shaifta owing to his family rank, was one of the honoured nobles of Delhi. But this full moon of perfect beauty added fresh lustre to the shining shield of his exalted father through his princely gifts and personal attainments. The dutiful son, did not only make the name of his father, but the name of his whole family, illustrious through his perfection and straightforwardness. In his very childhood like the children of all noblemen, he got opportunities of having the company of highly educated persons and therefrom he filled his skirt with roses (in other words, he fully took advantage of the golden opportunity that offered itself to him in his childhood). And according to the prevailing custom of the time, he did not rest satisfied merely with perfecting his Arabic and Persian studies, but also attained such proficiency in the oriental sciences and arts that such an acute critic and

* This essay was written originally in Urdu and has been translated by Syed Amir Ali M.A. The translation strives to bring out the flowery rhetoric of the original.—I. J. S. T.

able writer as Mirza Ghalib would not have shown his composition to another person without first reading it out to him and getting his plaudits and approbation, nor would he have before doing this, entrusted it to anybody for publication.

A great part of Shaifta's life was passed at Jehangirabad, Delhi and Meerut. In the Urdu language his position was that of being a master and disciple of the pride of the later ones, the head of the lyricists, Hakim Momin Khan Momin Dehlavi. And with regard to his poetical compositions in Persian, he used to get them corrected by Mirza Ghalib. During the whole of his stay at Delhi, he used to hold poetical assemblies. He used to be a stately pillar of the graceful companionship of Mirza Abdullah Khan Ghalib, Mufti Sadruddin Khan Azurdah, Mowlana Sahbaji and Myyari Rakhshan. God had made Nawab Shaifta educated in every way. The wealth of good birth and noble origin, the wealth of knowledge, the wealth of the world, the wealth of children, what thing was there which he did not happen to possess? Of the three sons, the eldest Nawab Md. Ali Khan Rashki was a distinguished and happy noble man. For some time the Nawab Sahib acted as a member of the Council at Rampur State, and afterwards he was nominated a member of the Council of the Governor-General for passing laws and regulations, as a representative of the United Provinces. The very pure, learned and intelligent second son, Nawab Naqshband Khan Majnun, did not see even the full spring season of the garden of his youth, when from the cruel hand of fate, that trims all the flower trees in autumn, he got levelled to the earth, and made one with it. His daughter was betrothed to Khan Bahadur Ghulam Md. Hasan Khan, formerly Sub-Registrar of Delhi. The third son Nawab Md. Eshaq Khan, after entering the Indian Civil Service, went on getting promoted to higher and higher posts, till at last he became a Sessions Judge. For some time he acted as the Prime Minister (*Madārul Maham*) of Nawab of Rampur but

reverted to Government service again, retired on pension, and finally accepted the exalted position of the Secretary to the Aligarh College. He was a large-hearted man with lofty aspirations and enlightened views. He used to behave affectionately towards the father of the present writer, and owing to old family connections, he would behave most affectionately towards the present writer too. During my life as a student Nawab Md. Ali Khan Rashki presented me with a summary of his writings, done by himself upon my soliciting him for it.

Probably, at the initiative of Mirza Shahib, Nawab Mustafa Khan chose Mowlana Hali, for the tutorial guardianship of his sons and therefore do we find Mowlana Hali teaching Nawab Rashki and his brothers for several years. This connection was by no means a small reason for the pride and exaltation of Mowlana Hali because the daily companionship of the late Shaifta proved like an elixir for him. The late Mowlana himself used to relate this to us and from his conversation, we could catch the fire and enthusiasm that lay hidden in him for Shaifta. It has been the ancient custom of the unmannerly Fate that joy and sorrow, pain and pleasure should for ever go together in pairs. And no one is exempt from this revolution of the wheel of Fortune. How then could Nawab Shaifta pass his life contrary to this law of nature? During the Mutiny the English magistrates held such wrong notions of him that his estates were confiscated. For several years he remained ruined and shattered by this calamity but at last in the end through the kindness of the Government his estates were restored to him and he then continued to pass his life with the same ease and comfort as before. It is not apparent from the odes (*Ghazals*) of Shaifta that his taste for poetry arose from his training as a poet. Rather it should be taken to have been a natural taste with him, and that the Eternal Distributor of Fate, gave him this inclination at the dawn of creation and put it in his very nature and temperament

and he was therefore created for this purpose. The generous Giver had of course endowed him with a very sound taste and a correct judgment. But his love for Momin Ghalib, Azurdah, and other eminent men of his time acted like the purifying chemical for gold. A correct taste, sagacity, weight and proper judgment permeate the very arteries of every one of his lines. When looked from the critical point of view it will be found that this expert in his art took to the grave the ancient trend of the Urdu tongue, for after the destruction of the royal houses of Delhi and Lucknow, the educated upper class lost all interest in the asiatic sciences and arts, and the learned experts in Persian literature remained in a condition of segregated loneliness. Slowly and eventually, all the delicate fancies, novelties, the strength and weight of words, the firmness of the constructions, the articulate beauty of the imagery, the purity of the thought, in short all those fine points that were necessary for Oriental poetry, and constituted its beauty, were forsaken by the poets, and hence now-a-days those qualities are seldom visible in the writings of the poets. Quite opposed to this, the attitude which the modern poets have adopted, and boast about, its foundation lies in the elegance of speech and the sweet way of expression; and the famous masters of speech of Delhi and Lucknow, consider these to be a means to their claim for perfection. After Momin and Ghalib, Shaifta deserves a thousand praises and commendations. Shaifta has shown his power over speech in Persian also. He had the advantage of the guidance of the late Ghalib in Persian and his *nom-de-plume* was Hasrat. A long time ago the *Diwan* of Hasrat and his letters were published. According to the ancient writers even being a biographer of poets was a proof of the wide views and consistency of the author. Hence, in pursuance of this principle, the famous poets of old, like Mir Sauda, Mustafi, Mīr Hasan, Qāim, all wrote biographical sketches along with their *Diwans*. Then how was it possible

that the steed of the imagination of Shaifta should not have shown a marching proclivity in this field difficult to be trodden. He also followed the ancient masters, and compiled a book named *Gulshan-i Baykhar*, being a biography of the ancient and the contemporary poets, in which after an impartial critical survey of the writings of every poet, he appended with a nice taste some extracts from the works of each. But it would not be improper to remark here, that whatever writings and information of the poets he could obtain by even a slight effort, he jotted down in his book—no refined weighing of point and critical research are shown by him as a necessary condition in the collection. We can infer this from the mention he made of Nazir Akbarabadi; for at first he has written of him as a Shaikh, though he was a Syed and next he quoted a line from him and ascribed it to some Nazīr of Benares, who was a pupil of Sauda, but by carefully going through the complete works of Nazīr, one finds that the following couplet,

> Even dim sight can discern thee
> O shining moon!
> The dazzling sun always remains
> wholly an eye (for seeing it)

is not from the pen of Nazīr of Benares but from that of Nazīr of Akbarabad. The opinion which Shaifta formed concerning Nazīr, could have been so formed only by reading such ordinary poems of his as *Āṭā-Nāmah* (the Book of Flour), or *Dāl-Nāmah* (the Book of Pulse); for he has characterised his writings as simple or common, which is not just. Rather, the truth is that Nazīr of Akbarabad can be fitly called the Shakespeare of India. Even Dr. Fallon, the author of several Urdu and English dictionaries, and several other famous Englishmen, who were versed in Urdu, have accepted him as one of the best writers of Urdu poetry; and the strongest proof is the fact that all his writings are replete with natural

beauties, moral and social pictures and his poetry is often worth looking at from the philosophical point of view. In portraying the beauties of the attractive scenes of nature and the hidden effusions of man, Nazīr seems to emerge quite clear from the thorny bushes of similes and metaphors in which he apparently loses himself. Mīr Qutbuddin Khan Batin of Agra, a disciple of Nazīr, on feeling vexed by the book called it *Gulshan-i Baykhizan* by way of retort. In this work he tried to remove all the points of blame that Shaifta had brought against other poets. In this attempt Batin is also to a great extent guilty of injustice, and for this reason critics do not much esteem Batin's criticisms.

Now I am going to point out the chief redeeming features and the niceties of some of the lines of Hazrat Shaifta. Acute critics of the art of poetry should carefully note what I say. The following lines (which are the opening lines) of Hazrat Shaifta stand in need of the special attention of people possessed of inner sight:

> No need for me to wait for wine or drum,
> I cannot reveal the secret so I feel helpless, shun.

Among the Sufis it is tantamount to gross infidelity if one reveals the secrets of God. Whatever calamities may overtake the Sufis, it is incumbent upon them to remain with their mouths sealed.

The intoxication of the wine of Divine Knowledge and the strains of the music of Reality cannot unlock their hearts which are in the repositories Divine Knowledge and therefore that Great Secret remains eternally locked up. This very topic is described with unparallelled elegance and nicety by the pen of Shaifta. The purport of these lines is this: "I don't require either music or wine, so that from the exaltation derived from the one or the intoxication from the other, I may be led to reveal the inner workings of my heart to the public at large. But as a matter of fact I have not got the

permission to reveal the secret. If I did possess it, then without all these attendant things, I would have unveiled the Mighty. Secret and thereby the eyes of the world and its ears would have seen and heard what effect Real Love produces, and what rank and position is granted to the true lover from the court of Love." A second couplet may also be here quoted :—

> The old man of the tavern showed that much last night,
> That even the idea of the goodness of fancy did not remain at all.

This couplet is also full of the same meaning. How and in what manner they reach the outsoaring and sublime heights of reality after attaining emancipation from the shackles of phantasms? The guide of the way has shown such glimpses of Divine Reality that after seeing the great Artist, imagination refuses to travel to the work of art. The beauty and vision of the great Creator has emancipated us from the phantasmagoria of unrealities stretched before our eyes.

God be praised! what an excellent subject to handle and how unique the interlinking of the lines. Note the wide applicability of the phrase "showed that much"; and the intellect feels astonished how and whence in these few words of this phrase such a vast extent of applicability lies concealed. So much for the mystic utterances of Shaifta.

Now look at his compositions :

> I am writing the condition of the fatigued soul.
> A severed vein is the thread of the ruler.

The poet apparently sits down to write to his beloved the story of his fatigued soul. So he takes up a severed vein to serve him for a ruler, an instrument not infrequently used when writing has to be carefully practised. This is the apparent signification of the lines, but quite a different scene is presented to our inner vision when we work inwards and

gauge the inner import of the lines. Picture to yourself an impatient lover contemplating to write a letter to his beloved and he wants to acquaint the object of his love with the agony and anguish of patient waiting; hence he prepares a ruler; and with a severed head flutters and manifests other signs of uneasiness consequent on his violent death: and this excessive post-mortem agony is well hinted at in the expression "a severed vein," and these violent convulsions after the beheading of every animal, is therefore not lost sight of by using the aforesaid phrase, "a severed vein." As rulers for such a purpose, it would be quite natural to make use of veins to make the threads thereof. Hence the graceful poetical conceit of making severed veins serve as threads of rulers. Hence he chose severed veins as proper threads for his ruler which is a unique one indeed when so constructed. Then he says that his life is restless and impatient through the pangs of separation and in proof of his impatience he adduces the fact that appeals to sight, *viz.*, that he has made a severed vein the thread of his ruler which he is employing for writing the letter. A second point that lies hidden is this that a lover always becomes lean and thin from separation and a proof of this also lies in the thread of the ruler, or in other words I have become so lean in separation from thee that I have become a mere thread like the thread of the ruler.

I now quote a clear and simple couplet:—

> (My) yearning is today impatient
> And yet the promise (of union) is for the day of judgment.

Though this is an ancient and worn-out topic, yet the beautiful interlinking of words from the pen of Shaifta has rendered it quite new. In the eager desire to see the beloved this yearning or craving every moment knocking at the weakened mind that the meeting with or visit to the object of love should take place anyhow immediately, but the beloved, of course, always postpones it till the morrow in the most

heartless fashion. This morrow that never reaches the state of actuality is nothing less than the Morrow of the Day of Judgment. Now to what state must the heart be reduced by waiting endlessly and all in vain for the moment of union with the beloved, which never comes, can be properly understood and appreciated only by those whose hearts have long suffered deeply under similar circumstances. What I had in view here was to draw attention to the chaste language used. Briefly speaking, the writings of Shaifta are a storehouse of universal comprehensiveness. So for the benefit of the reader I append below some quotations from the *Diwan* of Shaifta which will show the internal and external beauties of his style and ornamental composition.

1. When I said (to him) " Don't be a mate of strangers; "
   Then he replied with a wrinkling brow,
   " It is impossible (to obey);
   If he is angry with me, then this also does befit him
   But Shaifta I cannot be angry with him."

2. Let death now come so that my honour might remain;
   He has gone into mourning on the death of the enemy.

3. Even after getting entangled, the same budding out (i. e. enjoyment) of the heart is present,
   What a nice network have the life-bestowing glances woven,
   He went on calling the eternal injustice as an improper joke,
   (When) Shaifta was lost in admiration of some delicate intoxicated one.

4. For what purpose are these words of graceful speech?
   Has any fresh cruelty again come back to memory?

5. That rose-bodied idol (of my heart) came on the grave,
   For once my dying has proved (to have been not all in vain).

6. I offered him gratitude for his cruelty instead of complaining and came back;—
   How could I help it? Whatever lay within my heart came out on my tongue,

Alas! . the taste for oppression did not give me any rest,
Even if the heart got emptied of pain, then the mind felt tired,
You are dying but during your life-time your desire will be realised,
If Shaifta, that oppressor embarks upon his contradictory career.

7. It made the beloved feel deprived of even seeing the fun,
What was this (alas!) that sudden death produced.

8. Don't compare the valley of Najd with Delhi,
(For) that was the desert of Majnun and this is my desert,
Neither he came home, nor did he accompany my funeral, nor did he visit (my) grave,
Pity! A thousand pities! not even one of my desires got fulfilled.

9. So much was my work done in the beginning of love,
He is asking of the angel of death, about his ending
O Shaifta, even if he grant some one the power of bearing a kiss,
Here the taste for abuses has finished its work.

10. He would chant music in some stranger's house, but when?
Then only, when I won't be able to utter a single note,
I desire only for publicity, what do I care for ill-reputation,
Here, I am alive in the hope of the night of union, and there
Every morning it is hoped I sha'n't live up to the evening,
The evening even after reproaches demands a kiss,
(For he) won't be wiped out by the effect of the taste for reproaches.

11. Everything is his: but speak the truth, O messenger,
Do I tamper with facts, of my own initiative,
Please inform me what in your condition,
For Shaifta, no one grumbles without sufficient reason.

12. His hand alas! never reached up to the skirt,
That hand which had transformed the pocket into a skirt,
Let it be the fault of the tire-woman but the whole toilet is there,
Did she make her glance also artful,
You should not have disclosed your love to him, Shaifta;—
What is this you have done? You only made even the friend an enemy.

13. If there be no devotion, it does not matter, there is no reason for disappointment;
When is the occasion of magnificence of the Magnificent Being tied or restricted to a cause;

O impatient soul, a little more of patience is required,
Undoubtedly the gusts of the spring breeze would blow there also.

14. By showing just a little consideration for me,
He went on vaunting his own superiority the whole night.

15. Whose remembrance made me forget all,
How can I forget remembering him?

16. What shall I do, even if thou dost not come up to me?
I remain away from all only because of thee.

17. He can come a hundred times in my power,
But I myself am not within my own powers;
I got trampled upon as an enemy,
During the frequent comings and goings.

18. If I am slow in understanding things, then I am all the less involved in disturbances;
I am much better in my acts of foolishness than in all the acts of wisdom.

19. The lamp of love, specially so reserved, has alas so done it,
That they all burn me—both my relations and others.

20. There are rumours afloat as to the efficiency of the sight of the sore throat,
Or in other words, there are rumours afloat as to the kindness of the friend to me.

21. He had grown angry by being called Laila,
Hence I have intentionally become a lunatic,
If I say (to him) " don't mix with strangers,"
He replies, " Am I faithless then ? "

22. When the old one of Canaan saw me a lover (even) in my (early) youth,
He said (compassionately), "you ought to have passed (at least) enjoyments."

23. Alas ! he wakes up in the desire for the meeting of enemies,
And in the contemplation of whose eyes, I have no sleep.

24. Helplessly I (am) silent, and he (is) in rage,
And all the power possessed by me was used in restlessness,
When you have accepted kisses, then give up counting,
For perchance it may so happen that quarrel as to the number (thereof) might arise.

25. To-day also thou forbiddest wine, O virtuous man,
Does not the *Id*, appear as *Id* to thee.

26. Life should prove a burden when there be such variation in understanding :
I call it "Death", what you call "Shame",
He says, "What a misunderstanding ?" on hearing complaints of "Oppression",
I only practise coquetry, and you call it "Cruelty".

27. Wailing and lamentation (are) ineffective, the yearning for improvement (is) ineffectual,
Who can conduct my huntsman up to my nest ?

28. I cannot bear that pain he caused to (my) friends,
So, I should like to die in such a place that none may know of it:
His connection makes me feel further impatient,
If there be no outburst there, then there would not be even this much here,
I want such a wailing as may upset the world,
But the condition is that it may have no effect on me.

I have heard something of a floating rumour about Shaifta to-day,
But may God so will it that it may not prove true.

29. There on the breath of the morning breeze lies the gratitude for reaching there,
Because for the sake of my letter, he is willingly flying,
What an oppression! he, because of whom the disease is due,
Says, "If he lives, let him;—if not, not! What power can control destiny?"

30. O Shaifta I am an old man of the way in this art,
Though my age now is only of twenty-one years.

31. Though I hanker to meet you,
Yet I do not possess a yearning to see you.

32. When the taste for enjoying companionship gets confirmed,
Then how can the book remain under the arm?

33. Now he has begun to oppress strangers,
He has been instructed (and warned) by my death,
The flash of meaning has begun to be visible,
This form has been produced by constantly drinking wine.

34. That Shaifta whose austerity is so much bruited about,
How shall I say it, in whose house I saw him last night?

35. Shaifta is that, who his whole life,
Practised religion and virtue,
But finally he became a wine-worshipper,
Which is one aspect of His Greatness.

36. A half opened eye (i.e., half a glance) is enough for killing me,
Do nothing at all, only watch and smile.

37. Shaifta, although you have travelled a good deal,
Yet, do grace the tavern also sometimes with your visit.

38. Why should he feel vexed on being called cruel,
If he at all consider cruelty as something good?

39. Don't consider a favour as a favour, if it be bestowed out of selfishness;
Don't consider tyranny as tyranny if it be inflicted for the purpose of testing only;
Keep a fairy in the lap or a Houri on the knee,
My heart is fit for the stone of thy door:
The stories of one's love are true, but just a little bit,
I indulge in exaggeration, too, for embellishing a narration.

FAITH AS IN BUDDHISM.

B. M. BARUA, M.A., D.LIT. (LOND.),

Professor of Pali, University of Calcutta.

Comment on the *Abhidhamma* definition of Faith.

In the Pāli *Abhidhamma* Books the term faith (*saddhā*) has been defined thus: "The faith which on that occasion is a trusting in, the professing confidence in, the sense of assurance, faith, faith as a faculty and as a power—this is the faith there then is."[1] This definition obviously follows what Mrs. Rhys Davids aptly describes as "the method of the dictionary," since it is presented in terms which "mutually overlap in meaning, without coinciding."[2] It is to be understood that the three terms—Faith (*saddhā*), the Faculty (*saddhindriya*), and the Power (*saddhābala*)—are not exactly synonyms but are slightly different from one another in their connotation. This kind of specification implies a logical division, which is not rigid but flexible enough to allow one species of faith to pass imperceptibly into another that is higher. These so called species are but so many "aspects and phases" which, when viewed psychologically, admit only of a difference of degree, and not of kind. Faith in its specific sense, *i.e.*, as distinguished from the Faculty and the Power, denotes

[1] *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, 12, 15; *Vibhaṅga*, p. 123: "*Yā saddhā saddahanā okappanā abhippasādo saddhā saddhindriyaṃ saddhābalaṃ—idaṃ vuccati saddhindriyaṃ.*" The above translation is an extract from the *Manual of Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, by Mrs. Rhys Davids.

[2] *Manual of Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, Introd., pp. ix-xx.

only a kind of blind or professed faith as distinguished from a realised one.

The Hetuvādin distinction between Faith and Faith the Faculty—between practical wisdom and knowledge.

The all-important discrimination of the three species of Faith could not be achieved in a day or two, and not until the 4th or 3rd century B.C. when a Buddhist school, the Hetuvādin, pressed home a clear-cut distinction. "The average man of the world," they affirmed, "possesses Faith but not the Faculty."[1] In the same vein they sought to maintain that knowledge was not within the reach of the average man.[2] And in vain the Theravāda or Orthodox school contended for a difference of kind, logically considered. The latter appear to have conceded so far to the former that the uninstructed might possess practical wisdom but not knowledge in its higher technical sense. By knowledge the Hetuvādin meant the philosophic insight which consists in "analytic discernment, analytic understanding, ability to investigate or examine, the faculty of research, etc." Similarly he appears to have conceded to the Orthodox claim that the average man is "capable of liberality...and so forth," but he is incapable of faith as a Faculty, and far more so, of faith as a Power, for these higher forms of faith are impossible without the understanding of the true nature of things. In the case of the untutored, faith does not come from knowledge but originates from hearsay or time-honoured religious tradition. That is to say, the faith of the average man is not what the Buddha himself termed "the reasoned or rational faith" (*paññānvayā saddhā*).[3] Thus the Hetuvādin effected a significant distinction between ordinary faith and philosophic.

[1] *Kathāvatthu*, XIX. 8: "*N'atthi lokiyaṃ saddhindriyaṃ.*" Here *Lokiyaṃ-puthujjanassa*: Mrs. Rhys Davids and Mr. Shwe Zan Aung translate *lokiyaṃ* "in worldly matters," see the "*Points of Controversy,*" p. 342.

[2] *Op. cit.*, xx. 2: "*N'atthi puthujjanassa ñāṇaṃ.*"

[3] The expression has been quoted in the *Atthasālinī*, p. 69.

The characterisation of *saddhā* and *pasāda* in the *Netti-pakaraṇa.*

We obtain from the *Netti-pakaraṇa*, a work which is attributed to Mahākaccāna, a characterisation of faith showing some improvement on older *Abhidhamma* definition: "The profession of confidence is the mark of faith and the sense of freedom is its target. The absence of impurity is the mark of assurance and tranquillity of satisfaction is its target. Solicitation is the mark of faith, and unflinching devotion is its basis. Steadiness is the mark of assurance, and faith is its basis."[1]

The characterisation of faith in the *Milinda.*

Mahākaccāyana's analysis of faith in the *Netti* is illustrated in the *Milinda*. Faith is characterised by these two marks: (1) *Sampasādana*, tranquillizing in the sense of making the hindrances subside, and rendering consciousness clear, serene and untroubled; (2) *Sampakkhandhana*, leaping high in the sense of aspiring to attain that which has not been attained, to master that which has not been mastered, to realise that which has not been realised. Further, in the *Milinda* faith is contrasted in a general fashion with the hindrances (*nīvaraṇas*) of which *Vicikicchā* (doubt or perplexity) is one.[2]

Buddhaghoṣa's account of faith is based upon earlier conceptions.

Buddhaghoṣa in his *Atthasālinī*,[3] gives an account of faith which is mainly based on the analysis in the *Milinda*. It is truly observed by Mrs. Rhys Davids that "Faith is characterised and illustrated (by Buddhaghoṣa) in the same terms and approximately the same similes as are used in the Milinda... That is to say, it is shown to be a state of mind where the absence of perplexity sets free aspiration and energy: It is described as trust in the Buddha and system."[4]

[1] *Netti*, p. 28: "*Okappanalakkhaṇā saddhā, adhimuttipaccupaṭṭhānā ca. Anāvilalakkhaṇo pasādo sampasīdanapaccupaṭṭhāno ca. Abhipatthiyanalakkhaṇā saddhā, assa aveccadpasādo padaṭṭhāno. Anāvilalakkhaṇo pasādo, tassa saddhā padaṭṭhānaṃ.*"

[2] *Milinda-Pañha*, ed. Trenckner, pp. 34-38. The *Questions of King Milinda*, S. B. E., XXXV, pp. 54-58. *Saddhā uppajjamānā nīvaraṇe vikkhambheti.*

[3] *Atthasālinī*, pp. 119-120.

[4] Mrs. Rhys Davids: *Manual of Buddhist Psychological Ethics*, p. 14, f. n. 3.

Investigating the matter a little more closely, we can say that his account of faith is in reality a synthesis of analyses found in all earlier Buddhist writings, inclusive of Aśvaghoṣa's philosophical work—"*The Awakening of Faith*" (*Śraddhotpatti Sūtra*).

He maintains on the authority of the *Peṭakopadesa* that the antithesis of doubt is discursive thought.[1] Following other older authorities he speaks of doubt as " the contrary of belief, confidence, or faith." [2] " Believing or professing confidence in is the characteristic mark of faith, and its chief function is tranquillisation or aspiration. Sudden spiritual elevation of mind or emancipation is its ultimate end, and its basis is the object of reverence for the condition of *Sotāpatti*." [3]

Buddhaghoṣa's definition of faith which is very similar to the Hindu doctrine of Bhakti.

The Abhidhamma definition of faith assumes a popular character when it is re-stated in terms of Buddhaghoṣa's Commentary: " Faith is a trusting and taking refuge in the Buddha and other Jewels—the Doctrine and the Order. It is an act of believing in the sense of plunging, breaking, entering into qualities of the Buddha and the rest, and rejoicing over them." [4] Faith is the guiding factor of charity, morality and religion in the sense that it precedes all charitable, moral and spiritual instincts and dispositions." [5] Buddhaghoṣa refers elsewhere to faith (saddhā) as transforming itself or deepening into devotion (bhakti) by repeated practices. Love (pema) is invariably associated with faith. The other element

[1] *Atthasālinī*, p. 165: " *Vicāro vicikicchāya (paṭipakkho) ti Peṭake vuttaṃ.*"

[2] *A Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, p. 44, f. n. 3.

[3] *Atthasālinī*, p. 120; " Aparo nayo: Saddahanalakkhaṇā saddhā okappana-lakkhaṇā vā, pasādanarasā........ pakkhandanarasā vā......akālussiya-paccupaṭṭhānā adhimutti-paccupaṭṭhānā vā, saddheyyavatthu-padaṭṭhānā sotāpattiyaṅgapadaṭṭhānā vā."

[4] *Ibid*, p. 145: Buddhādīni vā ratanāni saddahati pattiyāyati ti saddhā... Buddhādīnaṃ guṇe ogāhati bhinditvā viya anupavesati... pasīdanti.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 120, saddhā pubbaṅgamā purecarikā hoti.

which accompanies it is *pasāda*, a sense of assurance, attended by serene delight out of satisfaction of a man's spiritual need.[1]

Buddhaghoṣa's classification of faith and love.

Buddhaghoṣa's division of faith into four classes is a novel feature in the Buddhist analysis. There are four species of faith :—

(1) Āgamanīya saddhā, adventist or adventitious faith, *e.g.*, the epoch-making faith of a Bodhisatta who is destined to become a supreme Buddha.

(2) Adhigamasaddhā, realised faith, *e. g.*, the philosophic conviction, gained by the Ariyapuggalas or Buddhists in the eight higher stages of experience.

(3) Pasādasaddhā, unshaken faith, *e. g.*, the unwavering faith (aveccappasāda) of a stream-attainer in the Buddha, the Doctrine and the Order.

(4) Okappanasaddhā, professed faith, which is, according to Childers, "outward or seeming faith which makes a man keep up appearance, but does not touch his heart, *e. g.*, the faith of Vakkali which consists in service, rendered in connection with the shrine, the bodhi-terrace, teachers and preceptors."[2] Again his reference to two kinds of love, temporal (*gehasita*) and spiritual (*saddhāpemaṃ*) is interesting enough as forestalling Svapneśvara's division of faith into *aihika* and its opposite.[3]

The self-discrepancy involved in the Buddhist conception of faith.

The Buddhist conception of faith is apparently involved in self-discrepancy. Buddha in agreement with Mahāvīra and other predecessors was of opinion that Doubt and Faith are two opposite states of mind, so that the affirmation of one implies the negation of the other: "If a person

[1] *Puggala-Paññatti—Commentary*, p. 248: "Punappunaṃ bhajanavasena saddhā va bhatti. Pemaṃ saddhāpemaṃ gehasita-pemampi vattati. Pasādo saddhāpasādo va."

[2] Childers' *Pali-Dictionary*, p. 410. The above classification of faith has been quoted from the Commentary on the Mahāparinibbāna-Suttanta.

[3] Svapneśvara's *Commentary on the Śāṇḍilya-Sūtra*, Aph. 18.

entertains doubt, is perplexed about the Teacher and the rest, he does not attain *mukti* by reassuring faith, and his mind does not bend towards earnestness, application, perseverence and energy—this is the first bolt of the heart in his case."[1] Buddhaghoṣa, on the other hand, asserts on the authority of the Peṭakôpadesa that the contrary of doubt is discursive thought (*vicāra*). How are we then to distinguish realised or articulate faith (*adhigamasaddhā*) from faith unwavering (*aveccappasāda*), when both are within the reach of a stream-attainer? The discrepancy involved may be explained away if we can effect a sharp distinction between religious belief and philosophic conviction, that is, if we can show that the sceptic is the common enemy of "divines and graver philosophers."

Faith *versus* Doubt in its varying degrees.

Supposing that doubt is the contrary of belief, it necessarily follows that, like faith, doubt admits of various stages of growth. To resist an overpowering doubt we require an unwavering faith. The Arahant is equipped with faith and other faculties and powers in a higher degree than the Buddhist Aryans who occupy the lower ranks; the Sotāpanna or stream-attainer who fills the lowest rank among the Aryans can claim a higher order of faith and the rest than a Kalyāṇa Puthujjana or good average man who is undergoing training, preliminary to the Aryan stage; and such a good average man is entitled to a higher position than a most ordinary

[1] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, p. 101: "Yo so...... Satthari (tathā dhamme, saṃghe, sikkhāya) kaṅkhati vicikicchati nādhimuccati na sampasīdati, tassa cittaṃ na namati ātappāya anuyogāya sātaccāya padhānāya......ayaṃ paṭhamo cetokhilo." Cf. Sthānaṅga (ed. Dhanapati), p. 289. "Se naṃ muṇḍe bhavittā agārau aṇāgariyaṃ pabbaie Niggaṃṭhe pāvayane saṃkhie kaṃkhie vitigicchie bhoyasamāvaṇṇe kālusasamavaṇṇe Niggaṃṭha-pāvayaṇaṃ ṇo saddahai ṇo patthiyai ṇo roei Niggaṃṭhapāvayaṇaṃ asaddahamāṇe apatthiyamaṇe aroemāṇe maṇaṁ uccāvācam ṇiyacchati viṇidhāyaṃ āvajjati paṭhama duhasejjā."

"If a person does not leave home as a shaveling to become a homeless recluse according to the Niggaṃṭha ordinance, seized by fear and sunk in sin he hesitates, doubts. is perplexed about the Jaina system, he does not believe in, does not take to, does not rejoice in the Niggaṃṭha mode. The result is that his mind gravitates from high to d ultimately destroys his prospects. This is the first way of lying on a thorny bed."

man of the world. Among ordinary men, too, there are some who cherish high ambition, and others who do not. Thus it is clear that faith can be classified as follows with reference to the persons concerned:—(1) the faith of the most ordinary man of the world, (2) the faith of an inquirer before he receives instructions; (3) the faith of an inquirer who is undergoing preliminary courses of training; (4) the faith of the Sotāpanna, an Aryan who has graduated himself in the Buddhist system; (5) the faith of the Aryans who have not as yet reached the goal; (6) the faith of an Arahant who has realised Nirvāṇa. The first of these may be named for convenience' sake *Okappana-Saddhā*, the blind or professed faith, characterised by the mark of satisfaction (*sampasādana*), and the last named is the highest faith, characterised by the same mark in a deeper sense of purity, tranquillity and bliss. The Arahant is said to be devoid of faith (*assaddha*) because there is nothing left for him to desire, that is, he needs no faith or aspiration (*sampakkhandhana*) of any kind. Similarly the second and third can be classed together under the professed faith marked by aspiration, and which is in a preliminary stage of articulation. The fourth is the faculty or articulate faith (*saddhindriya*) and the fifth is the power or strengthened faith (*saddhābala*).

Three species of Doubt and three species of Faith.

Doubt or Scepticism is broadly divided into three classes, *viz.*—(1) Doubt as a first Obstacle (*Vicikicchā Nīvaraṇa*, (2) Doubt as a Fetter (*Vicikicchā Saṃyojana*), and (3) Doubt as a Fetter inherent in lower nature (*Orambhāgiya Saṃyojana*). This division of doubt runs parallel to that of *Saddhā* into Faith, the Faculty and the Power. It is, therefore, conceivable that doubt is capable of as elaborate a classification as faith.

Religious doubt and philosophic doubt, contrasted: *Cetokhila* and *Avijjā* in relation to Scepticism in general.

The common name for religious doubt is *Cetokhila* (the bolt of the heart), and philosophic doubt is in some way allied to *Avijjā* (Ignorance or Agnosticism). There are five

Cetokhilas, the bolts which steal the heart against all tender feelings and higher aspirations, *viz.*, entertaining doubt, getting perplexed about the Teacher, the Doctrine, the Order, the Training (*Sikkhā*), and the want of fellow-feeling.[1] That the first four bolts represent together what is termed above religious doubt is manifest from Buddhaghoṣa's comments. He says that these are the four specific forms of doubt entertained:

Buddhaghoṣa's explanation of the four *Cetokhilas*. The definition of *avijjānīvaraṇa*.

"(1) as to whether or no the Teacher has the 32 major bodily marks, or the 80 minor bodily marks of a Buddha, or the requisite omniscience with respect to things past, future and present; (2) as to the adequacy of the paths and their fruits to lead indeed to the ground ambrosial Nirvāṇa; (3) as to whether those of the Order are indeed at various stages of the path to salvation, or have rightly won their way so far; (4) as to whether the Training is helpful."[2] *Avijjānīvaraṇa* is defined in the Dhammasaṅgaṇi (1152, 1162) as the ignorance of, or an agnostic attitude towards, the four truths, *viz.*, things past, future and present, and causality. *Avijjā* thus defined is distinguished at once from *Cetokhila* as an intellectual element from a spiritual one.

The Hindrance, the Fetter and the *Orambhāgiya* Fetter contrasted.

The difference between the Hindrance and the Fetter of doubt, or between the Fetter and the *Orambhāgiya* Fetter, is one of degree rather than of kind. The differentia (*pabheda*) provided by the ancient writers is this:—the Hindrance is a state of mind to be put away by religious belief and discursive thought, the Fetter by faith unwavering and insight philosophic, and the *Orambhāgiya* Fetter by *bhāvanā* (contemplation, introspection).[3] In the Abhidhamma books the two

[1] *Saṅgīti-Suttanta* (Dīgha, III), *sub voce Cetokhila*; Majjhima-Nikāya, I, Cetokhila-Sutta, p. 101.

[2] *Atthasālinī*, pp. 354-55. Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics, p. 260, f. n. 2.

[3] *E.g.* Vibhaṅga, p. 19, dassanena pahātabbā bhāvanāya pahātabbā.

pairs of words are set forth in definition in identical terms, although it must not be supposed that the conceptions themselves are identical. The Hindrance, for instance, can be got rid of by an average man through professed faith in the Teacher and the System, and by a young inquirer through faith in the system which he aspires to be acquainted with, or by a reflective student who is undergoing the preliminary courses of training. The Fetter, on the other hand, can be got rid of by a Stream-attainer through faith now confirmed and intellect now sharpened. Lastly, the *Orambhāgiya* Fetter which lies deep in the heart,[1] or flows in and out,[2] can be got rid of by the Aryans in higher stages through the power of faith and by circumspection. The Sutta-Piṭaka gives a category of five Hindrances of which Doubt is one, whereas the Dhammasaṅgaṇi enumerates six Hindrances of which Doubt and Ignorance are two.[3] Evidently the six Hindrances were the outcome of a further analysis of Doubt. However, the interest of the enumeration of first four bolts and the definition of *avijjā* is that they enable us to discriminate two sides of doubt. Each species of doubt presents two sides, *viz.*, spiritual and intellectual. On its spiritual side it can be put away by faith professed or realised, and on the intellectual side by judgment and insight. Thus the Buddhist division of doubt shows a resemblance to Hume's division into two species, *viz.* "Scepticism antecedent to all study and philosophy," and "Scepticism consequent to science and enquiry." The former is broadly represented by the Buddhist Hindrance, and the latter by the Fetter. So far as the Hindrance is concerned, doubt before instruction and enquiry can be removed by faith of which the characteristic mark is aspiration, and doubt at the inception of the career of a reflective

The Buddhist and Hume's classifications of doubt compared.

[1] Anusaya.

[2] Āsava.

[3] Hume's *Essaya*, R.P.A., No. 18, pp. 70-71.

student by discursive thought. Sāriputta, the chief disciple of the Buddha, holds that it is within the power of a stream-attainer[1] to shake off all kinds of doubt except those which are deep-rooted in our lower nature, and removable by introspection.

Twofold function of a Buddhist Sotāpanna.

It is stated that the four conditions of *Sotāpatti* on the side of feeling are unwavering faith in the Teacher, the Doctrine, the Training, that is, the four opposite states of the four bolts of the heart. The four conditions on the intellectual side refer to association with the wise, hearing of the good doctrine (study in the wider sense), reflective reasoning, and systematic knowledge of things.[2] Thus it can be proved that the Buddhist Sotāpanna is a religious philosopher whose duty it is to confirm the faith and understand the truth.

The philosophic significance of the Fetter of Doubt.

The Fetter with which the Sotāpanna is confronted is a philosophic doubt or scepticism proper with regard to the beginning and the end of things, or to use the words of Naciketa in the Kaṭhôpaniṣad (1-1-20), a doubt as to whether a person continues to exist or not after death.[3] But doubt which the Buddhist philosopher has to overcome is bound up with the question "as to whether there is a twelve-graded cycle of causation taking effect here and now or taking effect at all,"[4] or as to whether, in the language of the Buddha, causality (*dharmmatā, idapaccayatā*) is objectively and universally valid.[5]

[1] *Saṅgīti-Suttanta* (Dīgha-nikāya, III), *sub voce Sotāpattyaṅgāni.*

[2] *Sotāpattyaṅgāni* enumerated in the Saṅgīti-Suttanta (Dīgha-Nikāya, III include Satthari, Dhamme, Saṃghe, Sikkhāya aveccappasādo; sappurisasaṃsevo. saddhamma-savaṇaṃ, yoni somanasikāro, dhammânudhammapaṭipatti).

[3] Yeyaṃ prete vicikitsā manuṣye—astîti eko nāstîti caike.

[4] *Atthasālinī,* p. 355: dvādasapadakaṃ paccayavaṭṭaṃ atthi nu kho natthîti kaṅkhā.

[5] *Saṃyutta-Nikāya,* II. 25. Tathatā, Avitathatā, Anaññatathatā, Dhammatā, Dhammaṭṭhitatā, Idappaccayatā—these are all synonyms of Paticcasamuppāda. The

Thus the faith of a Sotāpanna is intended to put away doubt regarding the five points denoted by the Teacher, the Doctrine, the Order, the Discipline, and Natural Causation.

The articles of faith. As'vaghoṣa's views.

So we read in Aśvaghoṣa's Awakening of Faith,[1] a work which belongs to the same period as "The Questions of King Milinda:" "There are four aspects of faith.........(1) To believe in the fundamental truth, *i.e.*, to think joyfully of Suchness (bhūta-tathatā).........(2) To believe in the Buddha as sufficiently enveloping infinite merits, *e.g.*, to rejoice in worshipping him, in paying homage to him, in making offerings to him, in hearing the good doctrine (*saddharma*), in disciplining oneself according to the doctrine, and in aspiring after omniscience (*sarvajñatā*). (3) To believe in the Dharma as having great benefits, *i.e.*, to rejoice always in practising all Pāramitās. (4) To believe in the Saṃgha as observing true morality, *i.e.*, to be ready to make offerings to the congregation of Bodhisattvas, and to practise truthfully all those deeds which are beneficial at once to oneself and to others."

How Buddha and his followers carried on the work of their Aryan forefathers.

Those who are still in doubt that the Buddha was in every sense an Indian who, like his compatriots, carried on in his own way the glorious works of the Aryan forefathers, those who deny that the Buddhist analysis of faith was far in advance of earlier attempts in the Vedas and in the Upaniṣads, and those who are not inclined to admit that there is a close affinity between Jainism and Buddhism, so much so, that the one is to be estimated as a richer articulation of the other may with profit examine the instances cited below :—

(1) The Pâli Canon abounds in such expressions as the

same holds true of Bhūtatathatā and Dharmakāya. Kathāvatthu VI. 2; XI. 7; XI. 7. Laṅkâvatâra Sūtra. fasc. II., ed. Vidyabhusan, last page.

[1] Suzuki, *The Awakening of Faith*, pp. 127-28.

offerings of the faithful (*saddhādeyyāni*), alms given in faith (*saddhāya dinno piṇḍo*), etc. The Mahāmaṅgala Jātaka in particular, has a verse, which reminds one of the popular notion of faith found in the Vedas, and interspersed throughout the older Upaniṣads. "Food and drink which the faithful give, garlands and perfumes and unguents offered with a contented mind—these are said to be the causes of happiness in heaven." [1]

Vedic conception of faith in the Pâli Piṭaka.

(2) Buddha's strong plea for the cultivation of faith as a basic principle of human culture was derived from the same stock of Indian ideas as are contained in the Upaniṣads. The Saṅkhâruppatti-Sutta which embodies Buddha's powerful arguments may be regarded as a faithful reproduction of older ideas in a passage of the Chandogya Upaniṣad (VII. 2). "Here a Bhikku is endowed with faith, equipped with morality, replete with learning, enriched with generosity, vested with wisdom." The thought occurs to him, "Alas! would it be possible for me to be reborn so as to gain the status of powerful Nobles (or any higher condition of existence) on dissolution of the body, after death. It burns his heart, it occupies his thought, it makes his mind contemplate. Such dispositions of his, and pondering over things, developed and enlarged in this manner, pave the way for the attainment of his ultimate end. This is the road, this the path which leads to his goal." [2]

Buddhâ's plea for the cultivation of faith as the basic principle of human culture.

[1] Jātaka, No. 453 :

"Annañ ca pānañ ca dadāti saddho
Mālañ ca gandhañ ca vilepanañca
Pasannacitto anumodamāno saggesu ve sotthānaṃ tad āhu."

Cf. Rig. Veda, X. 151 : Chāndogya Up., IV. 1·1.

[2] *Majjhima-Nikāgo*, III. 99-103 : Idha Bhikkhu saddhāya samannāgato hoti, sīlena samannāgato hoti, sutena samannāgato hoti, cāgena samannāgato hoti, paññāya samannāgato hoti, tassa evaṃ hoti :—

Aho vatâhaṃ kāyassa bhedā parammaraṇā khattiyamahāsālānaṃ sahavyataṃ uppajjeyyanti. So taṃ cittaṃ dahati, taṃ cittaṃ adhiṭṭhāti, taṃ cittaṃ bhāveti, tassa te saṃkhārā ca vihārā ca bhāvitā bahulikatā tatrûppattiyā saṃvaṭṭanti. Ayaṃ maggo, ayaṃ paṭipadā tatrûppattiyā saṃvaṭṭati."

(3) Faith is the guiding factor which precedes all charitable, moral, religious and spiritual functions,[1] the basic principle of all virtuous deeds (*puññakiriyāvatthūni*), sanctioned by religion. The magnanimity of heart makes itself felt when something is given in faith.[2] These statements are made by the Buddhist commentator Buddhaghoṣa in a manner far more precise and definite than the crude fashion in which Yājñavalkya expressed the same thought, itself an improvement on the popular notion of faith in the Ṛg-veda : "Sacrifice is based on charity, charity on faith, faith on heart. Faith is conceived by heart, faith is established indeed in heart."[3] Moreover, the manner in which Buddhadatta and his younger contemporary Buddhaghoṣa applied the older psychological analysis of mind for the purpose of discriminating the virtuous deeds sanctioned by religion[4] conclusively proves that such a critical faculty was unknown to the ancients. For instance, charity which is one of the ten virtuous deeds is defined by the Buddhist thinkers as an excogitation or conscious yearning of the heart coming into play since the gifts are produced, before these are made over, and subsequently when the donor recollects these with a mind gladdened with joy."[5]

Faith is the basic principle of all virtuous deeds sanctioned by religion.

As to the close affinity between Jainism and Buddhism let one instance suffice. The Jainas enumerate these nine obstacles to faith (*daṃsaṇávaraṇiya*) :—Sleep, dozing, half sleepy state, deep sleep, deep-rooted greed, obstacles concerning faith in the objects of the four kinds of knowledge.[6] The five

The obstacles to faith as enumerated in the Jaina and Buddhist texts.

[1] *Atthasālinī*, p. 120.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 162 : Saddahitvā okappetvā dadāti cetanāmahattaṃ nāma hoti.

[3] *Bṛhad Ar. Up.*, III. 9. 21.

[4] *Abhidhammāvatara*, pp. 2-4 : *Atthasālinī*, pp. 157-162. Saddhā is conceived as a *cetanā*.

[5] *Atthasālinī*, p. 157 ; dānavatthūsu taṃ taṃ dentassa tesaṃ uppādanato paṭṭhāya pubbabhāge pariccāgakāle pacchā somanassacittena anussaraṇa kāle câti tīsu kālesu pavattā cetanā dānamayaṃ puññakiriyavatthu nāma.

[6] *Uttarādhyayana*, XXXIII. 2.

hindrances to faith as enumerated by the Buddhists include sensual desires, hatred, sloth and torpor, worry and flurry, and doubt to which may be added ignorance.[1] Of these torpor (*middha*), as appears from its definition in the Abhidhamma Piṭaka, covers the first four obstacles, mentioned by the Jainas.[2]

Conditions promoting faith.

"Faith is perfected," says Aśvaghoṣa, "by practising the following five deeds: Charity (*dāna*), morality (*sīla*), patience (*kṣānti*), energy (*vīryya*), cessation (or tranquillisation, *samatha*) and intellectual insight (*vidarśana, vipassanā*).[3] This pronouncement of Aśvaghoṣa reminds us of the word of the Buddha, quoted in the Milinda :—

> " By faith he crosses over the stream,
> By earnestness the sea of life ;
> By steadfastness all grief he stills,
> By wisdom is he purified." [4]

Faith is the germinating principle of human culture.

It is clear from this oft-quoted verse that *mukti* in its negative and positive aspects is attainable by faith, although human perfection requires the proper cultivation of other faculties and powers. Buddha has declared elsewhere that faith is the first principle to which penance, wisdom and the rest are subordinate. "Faith is a seed, penance the rein, wisdom my yoke and plough, consciousness the pole, mind the tie, mindfulness my plough-share and goad.........such is the tilth

[1] Kāmacchanda, vyāpāda, thinamiddha, uddhaccakukkucca, vicikicchā (avijjā).

[2] *Uttarādhyayana*, XXXIII. 2: nidrā, pracala, nidrānidrā, pracalāpracala. *Cf.*, *Vibhaṅga*, p. 254. Middhaṃ soppaṃ pacalāyika soppaṃ supana supitattaṃ; Atthasālinī, p. 378:

"Supanti tenâti soppaṃ, akkhidalādīnaṃ pacalabhāvaṃ karotīti pacalāyika." The Jaina commentator explains *pracala* as "the slumber of a standing or sitting person."

[3] Suzuki.—"*The Awakending of Faith*," p. 128.

[4] Sutta-Nipāta, Āḷavakasutta, v. 4:

" Saddhāya tarati oghaṃ, appamādena aṇṇavaṃ,
Vīriyena dukkhaṃ acceti, paññaya parisujjhati."

that I till, the tilth of which the fruit is immortal life, the tilth by which one gets rid of all kinds of suffering."[1]

The Arhant is indeed a person who has fully developed or cultivated these five moral or spiritual faculties—faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and reason.[2] Those who fill the lower and lower ranks are persons who cultivate these in a weaker and weaker degree. Those who are completely devoid of these five essential moral or spiritual faculties are placed outside the category of Aryans, and they are said to belong to the ranks of average men.[3]

The relative position of Faith and Reason in Buddhism. The classification of Arahants illustrating the point.

It is clear from this that, according to Buddha Gotama, the higher is the plane of cognition, the finer is the type of religion; the deeper are the convictions, the stronger are the expressions of faith. There are, in other words, the degrees of faith corresponding to the degrees of knowledge. Reason or Wisdom determines the quality of faith (*paññanavayā saddhā*).[4] The relative position of faith and knowledge in the wider sense can be inferred from the accepted Buddhist classification of Arahants into two orders: (1) Sukhavipassaka, the subtle seer, (2) Samathayānika, the mystic "who makes quietude his mode." This shows that among the Buddhist saints all were not gifted with higher perception, *i.e.*, not philosophers. There is another classification by which the Arahants are divided into three orders, *viz.*, (1) Kāyasakkhi, the intuitionist, (2) Diṭṭhippatta, the Intellectualist, (3) Saddhāvimutta, the Rationalist. Saviṭṭha considered the devout mystic as the best of all, Sariputta preferred the Intellectualist, and Mahakoṭṭhita preferred the Intuitionist. When the matter was referred to the Buddha

[1] *Ibid*, Kāsibhāradvāja Sutta, vv. 2-5.

[2] Saddhindriyaṃ, vīriyindriyaṃ, satindriyaṃ, samādhindriyaṃ, paññindriyaṃ.

[3] *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, V, p. 202: Imesaṃ kho bhikkhave pañcannaṃ indriyānaṃ samattā paripūrattā Arahā hoti. Yassa kho bhikkhave imāni pañcindriyāni sabbena sabbaṃ sabbattha sabbaṃ n'atthi, taṃ ahaṃ "bāhiro puthujjanapakkhe ṭhito" ti vadāmi.

[4] Quoted in the *Atthasālinī*, p. 69.

for a final decision, he regretted his inability to make any dogmatic assertion,[1] for any one of the three classes might appear to be superior to others according to circumstances. Although in this particular passage of the Aṅguttara-Nikāya (III. 21) the Buddha refrained from delivering a definite judgment on the question at issue, there are other passages[2] to indicate his real position. There he enumerates seven classes of Arahants, according to the highest place to the Ubhayabhāgavimutta, one who attains perfection by means of concentration and reason. The second place in his opinion is occupied by the Paññāvinutta, one who attains *mukti* by means of reason. Below him stands the Kāyasakkhi, the intuitionist who aspires to envisage the real as a single whole.[3] To an intuitionist analytical functions of the understanding, that is, all perceptual and conceptual reconstructions of reality are ultimately futile. The Intellectualist (Diṭṭhippatta) standing fourth in order of merit is a learned man who has ability to grasp and explain the philosophy of the Buddha. The Rationalist (Saddhāvimutta) who occupies the fifth place is a strong believer plus one who fairly understands the import of Buddha's system. Next comes Dhammânusārī the good man who develops the five faculties by faithfully carrying out the moral principles of the Teacher. In the lowest rank is placed the Saddhânusārī who develops the five faculties, essential to *mukti*, by way of blind faith in and through the love of the Buddha.[4] Here Buddha adds a word of explanation. In the case of the first two classes there is no further need of earnestness, for it is impossible for them to be careless. The remaining classes are nevertheless recognised in his system, because all cannot attend to a complete course of training.[5]

[1] Na sukaraṃ ekaṃsena vyākatuṃ.

[2] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, 478 f. n., *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, III. 21, *Puggala-Paññatti*, III. 3.

[3] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, 292. Mahākoṭṭhita who was an Intuitionist forces Sāriputta to admit that the real is an indivisible whole.

[4-5] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, p. 479: "Tathāgate c'assa saddhāmattaṃ hoti pemamattaṃ."

The complete course of training[1] is to be gone through only by an earnest seeker of truth, who, full of faith, approaches a teacher with whom he associates himself. Thus with rapt attention he hears the doctrine which he remembers, examines, and understands, whereby he begins to feel love for the subject, and finally he realises the highest truth by his own efforts and acquires deep insight by his wisdom.[2]

The Buddhist faith is essentially that of a religious student.

The character of the early Buddhist faith is set forth in the last utterance of the Buddha to his disciples, which is as follows :—" *Handa dāni bhikkhave, āmantayāmi vo; vayadhammā saṅkhārā, appamādena sampādetha*"—" Now I charge you, bhikkhus : All composites are subject to decay, be earnest in your duties." And this *appamāda* or earnestness is the one word by which the Master summed up his whole life, nay, this is the one expression whereby he summed up his whole teaching : " Regarded as a subjective element, O bhikkhus I do not find," he said, "any other element which conduces to the greatest good, than earnestness (*appamāda*) ; nor do I find any other element than earnestness, which conduces to the stability of the faith, and preserves it from getting[3] perverted and from disappearing." It is well said in the Milinda which is a classical Pāli composition dated about the 1st century A.D., that energy (*vīriya*, which is the positive nomenclature for *appamāda*) is the mainstay of all good qualities, illustrated by the following similes :—

The heroic character of the Buddhist faith. The relation between *saddhā* and *appamāda*.

(1) Just as a man, if a house were falling down, would make a prop for it of another post, and the house so supported would not fall down, just so is the rendering of support, the mark of energy ;

(2) just as when a large army has broken up a small one, then the king of the latter would call to mind every possible

[1] Anupubbasikkhā, anupubbakiriyā, anupubbapaṭipadā.

[2] *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I, p. 480 : *Aṅguttara*, ii. 5.-6.

[3] *Aṅguttara*, I, pp. 16-17.

ally and reinforce his small army, and by that means the small army might in its turn break up the large one; just so is the rendering of support the mark of energy, and all the good qualities which it supports do not fall away.[1]

In support of this interpretation of energy, the Milinda cites the following words of the Teacher from an unknown source. "The energetic hearer of the Noble Truth, O Bhikkhus, puts away evil and cultivates goodness, puts away that which is wrong and develops in himself that which is right, and thus does he keep himself pure." The earnestness or energy here contemplated with which he held fast to meditation under the Bodhi tree, is the determination so well expressed in many later poetical works, the determination not to deviate from the path of duty even if the heavens be rent asunder or the earth's stability be disturbed (*nabhaṃ phaleyya paṭhaviṃ caleyya*).

When a man steps into a Buddhist sanctuary I shall not be surprised if he will meet a votary or superstitious worshipper taking refuge in the Triad by repeating the set formula—"I take refuge in the Buddha, I take refuge in the Dhamma, I take refuge in the Saṅgha, once, twice, and thrice." But whatever the interpretation of these commonly accepted formula, to me the servile expression "I take refuge" seems utterly incompatible with the heroic spirit which the Buddha sought to impart to all that he said and to all that he did. It calls up a train of cowardly associations which befit a degenerated age. This is not verily the way in which a Buddhist who is to appear as a conqueror was called upon by the Master to profess his faith. The proper way to express one's faith is to say and feel: "The Blessed One is the Teacher, I am his disciple. The Blessed One knows and I do not...... let my skin, nerves and bones dry up, let my body of flesh and blood perish away, until my end is attained—the

[1] *Milinda*, p. 57.

end which is attainable by manly strength, manly energy, manly effort, I will not cease to strive."[1]

If it be admitted, then, that the Buddha made earnestness or energy the sustaining principle of his system, the question arises how it is possible for a person to pursue his aim with the heroic determination to do or die. The reply is only when he is conscious that he himself is the builder of his moral self (*attā hi attano nātho*) and that there is no other (*ko hi nātho paro siyā*). As a matter of fact this is the older conception of faith (śraddhā) which can be traced back to the Vedic hymns. In the closing period of the Ṛg-Veda, faith came to be regarded as a yearning of the heart (*hridayāya ākti*) [2] or insatiable thirst for the highest achievement of life. This thirst, as expressed in an oft-quoted stotra of the subsequent age, is to be led from the unreal to the real, from darkness to light and from death to immortality. Indeed the belief that a man is what he desires to be (*kratumya puruṣa*) [3] is admitted in different ways as the cardinal principle of religion in the age of the older Upaniṣads. The principle is illustrated in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad by the life practice of Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī, who is said to have become after death what he desired to be in this life.[4] With the growth of moral self-consciousness the principle came to be more emphatically expressed in these words "Whatever ends a person desires to attain, and whatever desires a person entertains, whether the attainment of the world of fathers or of mothers or of brothers or of sisters, or of friends or of wives, or of music and so forth, these come to be from the very act of his willing it, and thus endowed with it he is glorified."[5] In somewhat

[1] *Majjhima*, I, pp. 480-1.
[2] *Ṛg-Veda*, X. 151.
[3] *Chāndogya*, III. 14.
[4] *Ibid*, III. 17.6.
[5] *Ibid*, VII. 2-1-10.

later analysis a moral condition is consciously added, *viz.*, that a person aiming at something noble must be pure in heart (*visuddhātmā*).[1] Yājñavalkya came to formulate his theory of karma on the basis of this fundamental conception of Aryan faith. "A man is what he believes himself to be, as he desires so he acts, as he acts so he attains" and this is verily the doctrine of karma which was developed in the hands of the Buddha into a full-fledged system of religious ethics. This is in a sense the main point in regard to which he came to fulfil and not to destroy the supreme task which his Aryan predecessors left to him to carry out on an extensive scale. True to this religious instinct of India the Buddha proclaimed in the lion's roar: "Herein a bhikkhu is endowed with faith, equipped with morality, replete with learning, enriched with generosity, vested with wisdom, and the thought occurs to him 'Oh! that it were possible for me to be so reborn as to attain the status of powerful warriors or any higher condition of existence on the dissolution of the body, after death.' It burns his heart, it occupies his thought, it makes his mind ponder over. Such a disposition of his and pondering over things, developed and accentuated in this manner, paves the way for the attainment of his end. This is the road, this the path that leads to his goal." [1]

[1] *Majjhima*, III, pp. 99 f.

THE PLACE OF URDU IN THE INDIAN VERNACULARS

Abdul Majid, B.A., M.R.A.S.,
Fellow of the Osmania University of Hyderabad, Deccan.

In view of the misconceptions and misunderstandings prevalent among a large section of our countrymen as well as foreigners regarding Urdu, or to use its modern appellation, Hindustani, it seems desirable on this occasion to make a brief statement of its claims. To associate it with the name of Sir Asutosh, who has done so much to raise the status of the Indian Vernaculars, is also in the fitness of things. The *bonafides* of Urdu are impugned on the grounds of its linguistic inadequacy, the poverty of its literature, and defects of the script in which it is written. It would be well to say a few words with respect to each of these three charges separately.

(a) *The Language.*

Language may best be defined as the medium through which symbolical knowledge can be transmitted from one to another. It is the system of symbols by means of which it is possible for a human mind to be known to others. In education, its function is to symbolise ideas, concepts, feelings, and sentiments with as much convenience, precision, and clearness as possible, and the more a language satisfies this condition the nearer it approaches to the ideal of perfection.

But what are the requisites of a perfect language? A little exercise of common sense is enough to tell us that as regards their form the words must be (1) easy to pronounce,

(2) easy to assume the derivative forms, and (3) easy to combine with other words.

As regards the function of symbolisation it is essential, as has been pointed out by Mill, that (1) every general name should have a meaning, fixed and precisely determined, and (2) there should be a name wherever one is needed, that is, wherever there is anything to be designated.

The implication of the last pre-requisite is that there should be words for every sensation, every distinguishable degree of sensation, every thought, every feeling, in short, for every little nicety that human mind is capable of conceiving or feeling.

It is clear, however, that the above conditions cannot be fulfilled except by a highly developed language. The development of a language depends, in its turn, upon the mental development of the people who speak it, and is proportionate to the degree and extent of culture of the nation which expresses its mind through it. Those whose culture is of a high order necessarily require a language more developed than that of those who have not reached that stage of civilization. The language used by the latter is naturally poor and crude, not copious enough to respond to the high development of concepts and feelings possessed by an advanced community.

Now as to the bearing of these observations on the merits of the Urdu language. The origin of the term *Hindī* is not definitely known to history. Yet from a consensus of opinion among eminent linguists it may be safely concluded that Hindī was originally a generic name applied to the various ancient dialects of the Northern India as distinct to the Prakrits of the Eastern and the Western India. It is worthy of note that the language we now call Hindī was the language of the masses of India, but it was *not* an off-shoot of Sanskrit. In fact it existed long before the advent of Classical Sanskrit, co-existed with it, and has survived it. Beames, who made a special study of Indian Vernaculars, says:

"Sanskrit was not intended for the people......The local dialects held their own; they were anterior to Sanskrit, contemporary with it, and they finally survived it."

Dr. Fallon, the eminent lexicographer has said in the preface to his Dictionary:

"It seems far more probable that the rustic Hindi of to-day is the rustic Hindi, more or less changed, of the illiterate ancestors of illiterate millions now living."

Philological experience leads one to believe that in the course of time this "Prakrit" which I have called Hindī, the most ancient language of the people of the country, assumed two forms. One form of it came in direct contact and fused with the numerous incoming languages of India. Before the advent of the British there had been inroads of numerous peoples into India,—the Aryans, the Persians, the Greeks, the Scythians, the Arabs, the Afghans and the Moghals. And these peoples had brought their own languages with them; none of which, however, was powerful enough to supplant the language of the land. A process of mutual influence, adaptation and elimination, of give and take, action and reaction naturally ensued. One form of the old "Prakrit" freely imbibed these outside influences, viz., old Iranian, Greek, Scythian, Arabic, Turkish and Persian; the extent of influence in each case being largely determined by the length of sojourn that each people made in India. Mohammedan influence is thus inevitably seen to be the most dominant. This form of Prakrit is, in current parlance, the Hindustānī or Urdu language.

The other form of Prakrit which was peculiar to the rustics and had thus fewer opportunities of being "contaminated," imbibed little of outside influence, and even that little remained almost entirely confined to Sanskrit. This "undefiled" and puristic form of Prakrit is now known as modern Hindi.

Urdu and Hindī are not essentially different. Both of

them spring from the same mother-stock. Urdu chanced to adjust itself to the varying needs and conditions at each successive stage of its life and to draw for its nourishment upon various civilising sources. Hindī on the other hand, chose to remain pure. Of course no language can possibly remain absolutely pure and unaffected by external influences, yet speaking relatively it can be affirmed without doing injustice, that Urdu is an engraftment on the original stem of Prakrit of the Iranian, Arabic, Turkish and Persian influences, while Hindī represents the old and pure vernacular of Northern India with some admixture of Sanskrit.

To sum up, the following propositions seem to the present writer incontrovertible :—

1. In ancient India numerous spoken languages were current to which the general name of "Prakrit" was given.

2. Śaurasenī was the form of Prakrit spoken in Śūrasena, the country around Mathurā.

3. The term *Hindī* is a Persian word conveying two distinct meanings. In its wider sense it covers all the dialects spoken in Hind (India). In its narrower sense it denoted Saurasenī or that form of Prakrit which was the Northern *lingua franca* and with which the foreigners first came in contact.

4. This Hindī (in its stricter and narrower, sense), the common language of the North, the speech of the masses, came in the course of time to assume two different forms, one of which remained unmixed with foreign idiom, hence somewhat poorer in development, while the other freely imbibed foreign influences and thus grew richer.

5. The former retains the old appellation *Hindī*, the latter came to be known as *Urdu*.

The conclusion is now obvious. Urdu having incorporated with it the quintessence of several cultures is more fit for the medium of instruction, better equipped as a vehicle of literary expression, and more suited to the needs and

requirements of a progressive world than the less fortunate vernaculars of the land.

As a corollary to the above the vocabulary of the Urdu language is truly enormous. Derivatives from old Iranian, Greek, Persian, Turkish, Arabic, and latterly from English also, are found in it in very large numbers intermingled with words of Sanskritic and indigenous origin. This greatly facilitates the work of coining new technical terms. The Urdu writer on modern Western sciences can with perfect ease draw upon the vast resources of Arabic or Sanskrit, Persian or English,—of course with due regard to the proprieties of adoption, and in consonance with the genius of his own language.

Another distinctive merit of the Hindustānī language allied to its virtue of adaptability just hinted at, is its universality, in respect of which no Indian vernacular can ever approach it. Marāthī in Kashmir, Gujarātī in Behar and Tamil in Oudh sound almost as foreign as Bantu, while Hindustānī, as every one can testify by his own experience, is understood throughout the length and breadth of India, nay even beyond it, in such places as Aden, Port Said and Malta. Other Indian Vernaculars are at best provincial, Hindustānī alone is *inter*-Provincial. A very considerable portion of Hindustānī vocabulary is common to all the Indian Vernaculars, and it is therefore that even the people of those provinces where Hindustānī is not habitually used, do not find it absolutely foreign.

It may not be amiss at this juncture to cite the opinions of one or two well informed European students of the Indian Vernaculars, which might have the effect of further elucidating and confirming some of the conclusions arrived at above.

George Campbell, the author of *India as it might be*, in the course of a long dissertation on the desirability of having a common educational medium for the country observes :

Hindustani is commonly used by considerable classes throughout the whole country and is still more commonly understood. Even the

Mohammedans whose immigration was infinitely larger than ours and who made Persian to a great extent the written language, have universally adopted Hindustani as their spoken language and the general language of India, infusing into it a great mass of Persian words as we may from time to time infuse into it English terms.

Even to people who do not perfectly understand Hindustani it is an infinitely easier task to pick up a language habitually used by many around them, and of which a very large portion is common to all the tongues of India than it would be to learn one which is utterly and totally foreign ...

I would propose that in all the High Schools...Hindustani should be the common language, the vernacular languages also being used so far as necessary......It is almost impossible to get on well without some common medium, and if as I believe the idea of making English general is out of the question, it must be a great object to render Hindustani as common as possible. There may be arguments in favour of Bengali in the province of which it is the proper Vernacular, but in truth Hindustani is so commonly understood by all the classes...that I do not think it would be desirable to make an exception.

Speaking in another connection the same writer has made the following remarks :—

Hindustani being as I have said a *lingua franca* throughout India, is common to all the higher and I may say to all the ambulatory classes (sepoys, servants, etc.) to all Mohammedans and to all European residents, and it has a peculiar principle of adaptation to a degree far beyond any other language of which I have ever heard. If a word cannot be easily and exactly translated into Hindustani, no periphrasis is attempted, it is at once adopted, be it Persian, Arabic, Portuguese or English and it is wonderful how convenient and useful the practice is. We can use Hindustani for anything.

M. Garcin de Tassy, the renowned French scholar. delivered an address on Indian languages at the Imperial and Special School of Oriental Languages (Paris) on December 9th, 1869. Some pertinent observations from the Address would bear repetition even after the lapse of half a century :—

Urdu has taken throughout India the same position as French has done in Europe ; it is a language most in use ; it is employed both at the court and in the city ; literary men compose their works in it, and musical

writers their songs, and it is a medium of conversation with Europeans. It is said that Urdu is not everywhere understood by the Hindu population, but this is the case with all the languages in general use in a country; thus Breton peasants, Provencals or Alsatians do not understand French, but should this be a reason for ceasing to employ it at the law courts and government offices of the provinces. Urdu is understood in all the towns and in every village throughout India notwithstanding many other dialects that may be spoken there, and it is the sole language employed in the North West Provinces[1] and Oudh. It is not only confined to the four corners of India but is understood in Baluchistan and other countries adjacent to the Indian Empire. This fact has been proved by eminent tourists.

The following remark of J. Beames pithily sums up the result of a long and deep study of the Indian Vernaculars :—

> I consider it (Urdu) as the most progressive and civilised form of the great and wide spread language of the horde. *Not only is it compendious, eloquent, expressive and copious, but it is the only form in which the legitimate development of the speech of the Gangetic tribes could show itself*" [2]

In these days of Hindu-Muslim unity and Indian solidarity it is also well to remember that the Urdu language is not a relic of the Muslim dominance, but a symbol of the Hindu-Muslim *entente.* This is a happy mean between Arabic and Persian on the one hand and Sanskrit on the other. The stock of every language has only two fundamental elements, the noun and the verb ; other parts of speech having only secondary and derivative significance. Now in the stock of Urdu vocabulary, barring exceptions on either side, while all nouns are, as a rule either Arabic or Persian, all verbs are, as a rule of Sanskrit or indigenous origin. Thus *ānā* (to come), *jānā* (to go), *chalnā* (to walk), *bolnā* (to talk), *mārnā* (to kill or to strike), *marnā* (to die), *khānā* (to eat), *pīnā* (to drink), *uṭhnā* (to rise), *uṭhānā* (to raise), *baiṭhnā* (to sit), *baithānā* (to seat), are the kind of indigenous words which it is impossible even

[1] Now the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.

[2] *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* XXXV (1866), p. 1.

for the most pedantic of Muslim scholars to replace by others or to eschew. Foreign words like *jangal,* (forest), *māl* (wealth or property), *maidān* (open ground), *makān* (house), *pul* (bridge), *kāgaz* (paper), *tamāshā* (fun or spectacle), *sāl* (year), *darwāzā* (door), *sarkār* (government), *shikār* (game or hunt), *chāku* (pen-knife), are such as it would be equally difficult for even an illiterate rustic to avoid. In fact it was the genuine spirit of unity and self-sacrifice that induced both Hindus and Muslims to forego their respective languages and to adopt as their own a language essentially Indian in origin, but fully nourished and developed on foreign resources. Urdu was the practical outcome of this spirit of mutual cordiality and is still faithfully reflecting this spirit.

(*b*) *The Literature*

It is generally believed by those who do not know Urdu that the language does not possess any literature worth the name. Even some of the better-informed foreign students of Urdu, like Sir Charles Lyall and Sir George Grierson, do not express their dissent from this view in a strong and clear manner.[1] The belief, though so common, is very far from the truth.

True, Urdu does not possess a very extensive literature in comparison with the classical languages of Asia and the advanced western languages, but when the poverty of Urdu literature is maintained as compared with the vernaculars of India, the assertion must assuredly be seriously challenged. For after all the wealth of a literature is always a matter of comparative estimate.

Literary activities are of two kinds: (*i*) creative, and (*ii*) imitative. By the former is meant the original

[1] Articles on *Hindustani Literature* and *Hindustani Language* in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.), specially the article by Sir Charles Lyall.

contributions; under the latter heading is included the stock borrowed from other literatures by means of translations, adaptation and compilation. Let us look at each of these two aspects of Urdu literature.

To take the imitative side first. In Poetry and Drama, most of the world-classics have found their way into Urdu. Homer's *Iliad*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Valmiki's as well as Tulsi Das's), Kālidāsa's *Śakuntalā*, *Meghadūta*, and other works, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Tagore's *Gītānjalī*, *Chitrā* and several other pieces are accessible to the Urdu-knowing public. Shakespeare is perhaps the most popular. Most of his plays have been translated and are being staged. *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *The Tempest*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Cymbeline*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *A Winter's Tale*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Comedy of Errors*, and *As You Like It*, have long been available in Urdu. Some of Sheridan's plays, like *Pizaro*, and selected poems of Sophocles and Sappho, Dante and Goethe, Longfellow and Southey, Shelley and Byron, Wordsworth and Tennyson have also been rendered into Urdu.

In Fiction next to G. W. M. Reynolds, who, it seems, has a peculiar fascination for the Indian youth, Scott, Marie Corelli and Conan Doyle are the most favourite authors. A good many of their works are read with greater assiduity in Urdu in the valley of the Ganges than in the original on the banks of the Thames. Numerous works of Bankim Chandra and most of Tagore's tales have been rendered into Urdu. Latterly R. L. Stevenson, Rider Haggard, Oscar Wilde, Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells have begun to come into favour.

Among Essayists, the Urdu-speaking public have found their favourites in Macaulay and Carlyle, Smiles and Lubbock.

In the region of Philosophy and Psychology, Urdu possesses several *Dialogues* of Plato, selections from Aristotle,

Chanakya's *Maxims*, Seneca's *Reflections*, Berkeley's *Principles* and *Dialogues*, La Bon's *The Crowd*, *The Psychology of the Evolution of Peoples*, and *The Psychology of the Great War*; and portions of the works of Bacon, Hume, Kant, Mill, Spencer, James and Stout.

In General History and Biography, the names of Plutarch's *Lives of Eminent Greeks and Romans*, Rollin's *Greece*, Bury's *History of Greece*, Thatcher and Schwill's *General History of Europe*, Dozy's *Islamic Spain*, Wallace's *Russia*, Abbot's *Napoleon*, Green's *History of the English People*, Vincent Smith's *Ancient India*, Elphinstone's *History of India*, Malcolm's *History of Persia* and portions of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* may be mentioned as examples out of many others of equal weight and authority.

In the domain of Politics and Economics the following typical names would suffice: Aristotle's *Politics*, Mill's *Liberty*, *Representative Government*, and *Political Economy*, Bell's *Laws of Wealth*, Morley's *Machiavelli* and *Reminiscences*, Curzon's *Persia*, Mazzini's *Duties of Man*, Schuster's *Strangling of Persia*, Blunt's *Future of Islam*, Vambery's *Future of Islam* and portions of Seely and Bluntschli, Wilson and Pollock, Sidgwick and Jevons, Marshall and Morrison.

Allied to Political Science is Philosophical History and in this may be named the translations of Guizot's *History of Civilisation*, Buckle's *Civilisation in England*, LeBon's *Civilisation of the Arabs* and *Civilisation of Hindustan*, Lecky's *European Morals*, Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe* and Dutt's *Civilisation in Ancient India.*

In education, besides several works like Tod's *Student's Manual*, Urdu is not unfamiliar with the works of Spencer, Bain, Froebel, Pestalozzi, Herbart and Montessori.

In Science in addition to numerous popular treatises of a general character like Draper's *Conflict between Religion*

and Science, the Urdu-speaking public is fairly well acquainted with the works and researches of Darwin, and Wallace, Haeckel and Huxley, Lyell and Geikie, Tyndal and Bose, Kelvin and Maxwell, Crookes and Lodge.

To allude to the translations of standard works on Law, Jurisprudence and Medicine is superfluous, since quite a large number of them have as a matter of necessity found their way into Urdu.

It should be noted that the above lists are in no way exhaustive. The names given are taken at random and only with a view to give the reader an idea of the varied sort of foreign wealth that Urdu literature possesses.

Another important fact worthy of notice is that the above lists, sketchy as they are, are mainly confined to the literature of the West. The Arabic and Persian stock of Muslim literature, almost entirely, and the sacred Sanskrit and Hindī literature of the Hindus, to a large extent, have been reproduced in Urdu. The *Koran*, the *Gītā*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* have each of them several translations in this language. The life and teachings of the Prophet, of Jesus Christ, of Śri Krishna, of Śri Rama Chandra, of Gautama Buddha, of Guru Nānak and of Kabir, as also the works of Hindu divines and Yogis like Vaśishtha; of saints and mystical poets like Maulana Rumi and Hafiz; of moralists and theologians, like Sa'adi and Ghazzali; of epic poets like Firdausi; of philosophers like Avicenna; of historians like Ibn Khaldun, Ibn Khallikan and Farishta, are some of the best gems in the treasury of Urdu literature.

The creative aspects of Urdu literature need not detain us long. No objective test can be laid down whereby the relative merits of various authors are to be adjudged. Here taste alone is to be the final arbiter. The race of poets that numbers amongst it Mir and Dard, Ghālib and Hāli, Anīs and Dabīr, Atish and Dāgh, cannot surely be found lacking in

poetical genius. Among the living, pre-eminent stands the name of Akbar in whom wit and humour are so admirably blended with the greatest profundity of thought and philosophical insight as to present an almost unparalleled phenomenon in the world of poetry. Next to him comes the forceful Iqbal who has long been propounding his philosophy of action—the theme of Gītā—with marvellous effect and originality, and some of whose Persian poems have been translated into English by Professor Nicholson. Then again we have Hasrat and Riāz, Azīz and Josh, who cannot suffer in comparison with any poet of any language.

In fiction, the works of Nazīr Ahmed, Mirza Ruswā, Abdul Halim Sharar, Ratan Nath Sarshār, Rashīd-ul Khairi, Khwājā Hasan Nizāmī and Prem Chand require only to be read to be immensely admired,—to mention nothing of the older voluminous story books. Not a few of these masterpieces have been rendered both into English and Hindī.

Among serious prose writers Urdu can rightfully boast of Sir Syed Ahmed, Nazīr Ahmed, Mohammed Husain Azad, Chirāgh Ali, Hālī, Shibli Karāmat Husain, Syed Sulemān and Abul Kalam Azad. Mohammed Husain Azad's poetical prose and his fine imagery have been a standing marvel. Nazīr Ahmed's personality was unique in his ready command of Urdu, Persian and Arabic. Shibli was great as a historian; but he was even greater as a literary critic and a man of letters. His encyclopedic *Life of the Prophet* (in six large volumes) stands as a permanent tribute to his erudition. His compendious *History of Persian Poetry* (5 vols.) has evoked feelings of very warm admiration in that famous Orientalist, Professor E. G. Browne, who has very copiously quoted from the said work in the third volume of his *Literary History of Persia.* Karāmat Husain (an ex-judge of the Allahabad High Court) was a profound philologist and also a keen student of sociology. Syed Sulaimān is the inheritor of Shibli's historical and literary legacy and is devotedly treading

the footsteps of his late master. As for religion, theology and mysticism, the record of Urdu literature is decidedly not poor.

Three central institutions during recent years have come into existence with the diffusion of Urdu literature as their primary object. The biggest of these is the Osmania University Translation Bureau of Hyderabad, Deccan, where the work of translation, adaptation and compilation from English text books on nearly every conceivable subject,—history, political science, logic, ethics, psychology, metaphysics, economics, mathematics, biology, physics, chemistry and every other science is going on at a rapid pace. The second is the Anjuman-e Taraqqi-e Urdu (Association for the Promotion of Urdu) with its headquarters at Aurangabad (Deccan). It has so far published some dozens of books chiefly dealing with Western arts and sciences, e.g., zoology, geology, psychology, botany and economics. Yet another is the Dār-ul-Musannifin (the Authors' Home) or Shibli Academy, founded in memory of that scholar at Azamgarh (U. P.). It deals mainly with Orientalia, yet has also produced some good books treating of European philosophers and psychologists like Berkeley and Le Bon.

Perusal of the foregoing facts and observations is likely enough to convince all unbiassed readers that Urdu literature though it may not be exceptionally rich and unusually extensive, is not so poor and so scanty either as is generally believed, and that it is able to hold its own against any other modern Indian Literature.

(c) *The Script.*

The most serious obstacle to the proper recognition of the claims of Urdu, however, is the alleged defective nature of its script. It is said to be cumbrous, difficult, puzzling to the learner, and liable to be mispronounced and mis-spelt. This

objection is based on a series of misconceptions and can be very easily disposed of.

The merits and demerits of a script can be adjudged on two grounds, (*i*) phonological and (*ii*) caligraphical. We shall look at each of these separately.

According to philologists, in a perfect alphabet (1) every separate elementary sound ought to have a separate symbol to express it and none but separate elementary sounds ought to have separate symbols; and (2) to mark off different combinations, modifications and mutations of the same elementary sound there ought to be sufficient means and contrivances though not characters wholly different in form.

Letters of every alphabet are primarily intended to represent by visible signs the articulate sounds that are employed in speech. The main use of an alphabet is to represent the spoken language by means of adequate signs. So the merits of an alphabet are proportionate to the accuracy, ease and exactness with which its letters can represent the articulate sounds. Unnecessary multiplicity of letters denoting diphthongs and conjunct consonants, viewed phonetically, are defects and hindrances rather than helps and advantages.

Judged by these criteria the Urdu alphabet scores an easy victory over its rivals. It contains letters and symbols to represent all the elementary long and short vowels and simple consonants, and at the same time does not possess any letter to represent a diphthong or conjunct consonant. Unlike the Nāgarī alphabet, it is not made cumbrous by the introduction of intricate and unnecessary letters to represent diphthongs and conjunct consonants. Unlike Nāgarī, it is not burdened with a double series of forms, viz., one, the primary form of the letter and the other, the secondary form. The Urdu alphabet has ten vowel sounds made up thus:

(1) three primitive vowels not represented by separate letters but by diacritical marks called *fatha*, *kasra* and *zamma*.

(2) three corresponding long vowels formed by introducing the homogeneous letters of prolongation immediately after the preceding short vowel. For instance the letter *alif* (inert) preceded by a letter movable by the vowel sign *fatha* forms the long sound *ā*. Similarly the letter *wau* (inert) preceded by a consonant movable by the vowel sign *zamma* would form the long vowel sound *ū*. The letter *ya* (inert) preceded by a consonant movable by the vowel sign *kasra* would form a long vowel *ī*.

(3) two diphthongs.

The letter *ya* (inert) preceded by a consonant movable by *fatha* forms the dipthong *ai*.

And the letter *wau* (inert) preceded by a consonant movable by the vowel sign *fatha* forms the diphthong *au*.

(4) two long vowels peculiarly Persian known as *majhul* (meaning "unknown"), formed *ya* and *wau*, the former sounding like *e* and the latter like *o*.

In its essence the Urdu alphabet is Arabic. But the tendency towards eclecticism in order to achieve comprehensiveness and completeness which we have seen to be a distinctive feature of the Urdu language has also manifested itself in the domain of script inasmuch as the present Urdu alphabet represents an admixture of Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit sounds and contains several letters of non-Arabic origin.

The result is that Urdu alphabet is phonetically as perfect as it has been hitherto possible for any human alphabet to be. Sir William Jones speaking of Arabic alphabet has said:—

"A perfect language would be that in which every idea capable of entering human mind might be neatly and emphatically expressed by one specific word, simple if the idea were simple, complex if complex; and on the same principle a perfect system of letters ought to contain one specific symbol for every sound used in pronouncing the language to which they belonged. In this respect the old Persian approaches to perfection; but

the Arabic alphabet, which all Mohammedan nations have unanimously adopted, appears to me so complete for the purpose of writing Arabic that not a letter could be added or taken away without manifest inconvenience."

The remark applies with even greater force and truth to the Urdu alphabet.

Now to view the question from caligraphic standpoint. A very important fact generally disregarded in other alphabets is that the written symbols representing the articulate sounds are essentially of the varieties, vowels and consonants. Vowels are the basis of all kinds of sounds and are utterable at the opening and closing of consonants. The function of vowels is simply to govern, to guide and to direct the pronunciation of consonants. This distinction between the two sets of letters has been lost sight of by many languages. Urdu is almost unrivalled in this respect that it has kept up this distinction by refusing to recognise vowels as separate letters. In it the primary vowels are only represented by diacritical marks and not as independent letters. Urdu caligraphy therefore, quite rightly does not assign to vowels any place as independent letters but relegates them to the position of diacritical marks.

The objection that the same words can be read differently in the absence of diacritical marks in ordinary Urdu writing merely indicates superficial knowledge. It is well put by an eminent scholar, "the omission of diacritical marks implies in the reader a sufficient familiarity and practice in reading the written character so as to enable him to proceed without the help of diacritical marks. These marks are not omitted for the purpose of bewildering beginners or those who are unfamiliar with the language. *It is one of the objects of the Urdu system of writing that the labour of reading and writing may be lightened and simplified during the process of education.* It is a part of the training and culture of the Urdu scholar that he should be able to read and write accurately

even in the absence of these marks, and he is soon capable of doing so.

To say that the *Ghasīṭ* style of Urdu writing is extremely illegible and hard to decipher is to put forward a very puerile objection. Like the colloquial form of every language, the running and broken form of writing is common to every system of writing and is not a peculiarity of the Urdu script alone. Its utility lies in its facility and fluency and its use is meant only for those who are very well conversant with the Urdu language.

Urdu caligraphy is a sort of natural shorthand writing; every letter has a short form as well as a full one and it is the method of combining these short forms into words that has made Urdu writing extremely easy. It has ensured for it economy of space, economy of time and economy of energy both for the writer and reader.

Further, this script, with slight modifications, is common to all Muslim lands. It extends from East Bengal to Tripoli and Morocco in the West. The international advantages of adopting a script which is used not only in India but is current in Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Muslim Turkistan, Persia, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and the North African states are not so insignificant as to be easily ignored.

FAKIR MOHAN SENAPATI

LAKSHMIKANTA CHAUDHURI, M.A.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Ravenshaw College, Cuttack.

To sit in judgment over a poet is always a difficult task and the difficulty is further increased when it is not definitely ascertained how far his works will survive the ravages of time. A contemporary poet is too near to our eyes to be properly appreciated and the attention that we bestow on the details of his life prevents us from forming a complete idea of his poetry. Fakir Mohan died only a few years ago. The admiration which we had felt for his personality, the veneration with which we were taught to regard him, the worship which we offered to him because every one did the same, must affect our judgment of his poetical works and the unique position which he held in the literary world of Orissa, and the influence which he exerted upon other authors would render it difficult for us to form a just estimate of his works as permanent contributions to the literature of Orissa.

One difficulty in estimating his worth is that it has not been possible definitely to ascertain what mode of expression came natural to him. He wrote poetry when he was young, but when he had reached old age he took up prose. Many of his works are still unpublished and all his activities in the field of literature have not yet been revealed to the public. No definite estimate of his powers is possible under these circumstances and an estimate which does not take into consideration his translation of the *Mahābhārata*, over which he was engaged for nearly twenty years of his life, can never pretend to be final. On the one hand Fakir Mohan has been extolled as the "Vyāsa Kavi"—a sage poet, rivalling Vyāsa

n literary dignity and power of sustained narrative, and on the other hand he has been hailed as the father of Oriya prose fiction.

At the very outset let us confess that he was by no means such an outstanding genius as would startle the world. He never attempted to expound the mysteries of existence. He had no universal panacea to suggest for worldly pains and he had but little consolation to offer to the man bowed down by sorrows and miseries. But there is one thing which is at the very root of all his activities and serves as the keynote to all his writings—his *patriotism*. He only amused himself with literature and had no deep passion which must burst forth into song but whenever he took up his pen he tried to instil into the minds of his countrymen that love for Orissa and that readiness to sacrifice the self for the benefit of the Motherland. And he was never tired of preaching it as can be seen from many a passage from his writings. From a study of his literary activities it is evident that even though he had a mastery over the short swinging metre of the *Bhāgavata* and a command over the rhyming couplet, the very ease and facility with which he composed his poems in this artless metre of the people, shows that he was inspired by a patriotism which longed to develop the folk literature of Orissa. There was the craze for following the footsteps of Rādhānāth when he began his literary career and thus he took up poetry as the medium of his expression. At a later stage when he felt that Orissa lacked novels he began writing stories and rose to eminence in this new venture. It was his patriotism which made him sympathise with the defects of his countrymen, which made him feel for his motherland and made him come into touch with the lowest of his countrymen. It is this patriotism indeed which makes his personality so very appealing to the people of Orissa.

But it cannot be denied that he had an instinctive love for literature and a genius for literary art. Patriotism only

fanned this genius and made it burn higher and brighter than it might have otherwise done. There is in him a naïveté of expression, that artless simplicity of diction, that absolute abhorrence of all affectation either in thought or in language that marks him out as the poet of the people—the masses. Education did not make him a pedant, and the study of Sanskrit did not root out from his heart and his brain his abundant stock of colloquial phrases and expressions. He passed calmly through all the vicissitude of his life: he had drunk of life's cup to the dregs; his career at many stages was that of an adventurer. These experiences had great effect in making him sympathise with the aspirations and daily miseries of the common people; they left him confirmed in that common-sense view of life and that robust natural humanity which we love so much to see in our dearest friends.

He poses before us an ordinary man, and like an ordinary man he points out those abnormal features which make our actions appear ludicrous. His genius lay mainly in sarcasm; which is the one characteristic predominating over his whole personality. He excels as a caricaturist, and procures for his victims the contempt of the reader whenever he portrays them in his own subtle fashion. This sarcasm animates all his novels and stories and though it is rather suppressed in his poems it appears unexpectedly and at unexpected places.

Like all humorists he drew his portraits in detail. He exaggerates the minor traits and presents vividly before us a life-portrait of the man described. Often indeed the details are so numerous that they seem tiresome. The story about Ananta, the widow's son, is dragged along by a detailed reference to the life which his father led.

Fakir Mohan gives us in the story about Kalika Prasad Gorap a long, and animated, dialogue. His desire for details often leads him astray and makes him indulge in unwarranted digressions even in his short stories. But often

indeed he is saved from being tedious by the insight into human nature which all his writings disclose. The quaint inherent humour of his sketches of individual character is unmatched in the whole range of Oriya literature and delights us by its delicate geniality or boisterous fancy.

The whole strength of Fakir Mohan lay in these details. What he saw he narrated with the minute eye of the humorist; he had a keen insight into the common frailties of human nature and was acquainted with the meanest occurrences of every phase of existence. When all this imagination and sympathetic insight is clothed in a witty and racy language the resulting production becomes extremely charming. But he had perhaps during his early years no confidence in himself and therefore this view of humour is entirely absent from most of his poems. Very often therefore his early poems read insipid and stale. The genius of Fakir Mohan is not manifest in them. Only in his *Utkal Varman* there are some traces of this vein of sarcasm but here the hand of the novice is very often clearly noticeable and the early promise of this book is only fulfilled in the stories and novels that he wrote when he was old.

In his poems there is often the quiet unobtrusive dignity of the natural philosopher who depends on the wise dispensation of a Divine Providence and who calmly embraces the vicissitudes of life because he knows that there is a God to think of him. The philosophy of life with which he began his literary activity had much of that robust optimism which is only possible in the case of a man who feels the existence of God permeating this universe. The world is to him by no means a place of bliss, the pains which we would fain forget encounter us again and again and the path of life instead of being straight and easy is rough and crooked by the sorrows of this world.

Every moment of his life he bears on his shoulders the burden of misery of unfulfilled desires and daily anxieties,

and then there is the inevitable end to mortal pain and strife—the burning ground. When he sees it Fakir Mohan passionately cries out, "This is the place where all things end; this is the place where we can obtain peace of heart."

He was saved from being a pessimist by his faith in God. At the sight of all human miseries he cries out, half in despair, "Let Thy dispensations be fulfilled in my life, I shall not be cowed down by pain and sorrow, let Thy glory shine forth through my life." For him the stream of life flows on, nobody knows whence and whither; none can guess what attracts it to its destiny, until one day it joins with the sea of Eternity and becomes mingled with the life of the All-Merciful Divinity. This view of life is essentially that of an optimist. He starts indeed with the consciousness of pain and misery but never once in spite of sufferings, which form the lot of every man upon this earth, does he lose his consciousness of the final goal, his idea that there is a Divine Dispensation, and that there is ultimately the all-embracing Mercy of our Heavenly Father which alone makes life bearable and compels us to surrender ourselves to His Will.

He is conscious that real pleasure consists in sacrifice of self and thus ensuring continual peace and happiness in life. The sins that he has committed deserve heavy punishment but he has surrendered himself at the feet of his God and is not afraid. His sorrows afflict him indeed, but he welcomes them as his friends, because they sternly make him conscious of the path of virtue.

It is remarkable that with the study of the *Upaniṣads* his view of life changes in one material point and he regards life at a later stage, as really full of pleasure. It was natural that his innate optimism would take this turn and when the pantheism of the Vedanta entered his heart, there was no place for any grain of pessimism to remain in his mind. Life was still far from being rosy, but the gloom has already

disappeared and there is a deeper and more fervent faith in a happier and pleasant life in the ages to come in the place of his earlier helpless surrender to Divine Mercy. He still regards his life as being spent uselessly in the pursuit of vain pleasures, he is weary of his life in this earth and prays that he might be protected from being led astray in this world, but in his old age he becomes conscious of the glorious beauties of nature and for the first time he arrives at the blissful conclusion that the world is really a happy place to live in. God is the fountain from whom all pleasures flow and a man on whose heart has fallen a drop of this eternal happiness can rise above the miseries of life and can regard his days as linked to each other by continuous pleasure. It is noticeable that at no stage of his life was he cowed down by his miseries. He tells us that there is pain and evil, but he also tells us that we should make our lives happy by thinking of the glory of God and by surrendering ourselves to His will.

This view of life owes a great deal to the spirit of the age in which he lived and also to the vicissitudes which he had to undergo in his own life. The days of Upendra Bhanja were gone when everyone could spend his days in thinking of the pleasures of life and when love formed the only topic for which the people cared. The natural reaction against this sensuality found its expression in many beautiful passages in Rādhānāth and it is this spirit—this common-sense view of life—which actuated Fakir Mohan. The eternal rest which he so longs for is certainly a result of his study of the *Upaniṣads*, but the deep consciousness of the miseries of this world and the special stress which he laid on the curative power of sorrow merely reflects the spirit of the age in which he lived.

His ideal of poetic art in like manner never pretended to be sublime. When he draws a comparison between a poet and a painter he lays stress on the mental images into which the poet infuses life; and the poet's work is, in his opinion, merely to revive in our minds those forgotten

pains and pleasures, which we have passed through during our life. He never regarded poetry as a powerful weapon in his hands, for he never thought very seriously about his mission as a poet. He merely amused himself in his leisure hours by writing smooth and elegant verse and his only solace was that when he wandered in the regions of imagination, our mundane-existence ceased to attract or affect his mind. He found consolation in the thought that in taking up literary pursuits he was serving his motherland and embellishing his mother-tongue and his own comfort was that he lost touch with the material objects of this miserable earth. In his dreams Fakir Mohan heartily sympathises with the Spirit of Poetry which had admonished Upendra Bhanja to regard poetic gifts as higher and more admirable than sovereignty on earth. Fakir Mohan was careless of men's praise or their ignorant contempt towards his songs, for he sang merely for the unburdening of his own heart.

As has been hinted above, he wrote poetry because this was a way of enriching the literature of his motherland and Fakir Mohan loved his country with all the passionate intensity of a person who had fought strenuously on her behalf. In his poem on "the Land of Utkal" he tells us what grief he felt when his motherland was insulted and he tells us how passionately he was attached to his country as the one thing which could assuage all the miseries of his heart. It is this patriotic feeling, this intense love for the mother-tongue, born out of a consciousness of having fought for its very existence when it was endangered, which made him take up poetry and he persisted in his songs; because he found this to be the one pleasure in which he could indulge amidst the sorrows of this earth.

Only his *Bauddhāvatār Kāvya* deserves some special mention. This long poem, conceived in the form of an epic and executed with a keen eye to the details of Buddha's life, attained to something like epic dignity. It has got nothing of the

solemn grandeur of epic movement, it has nothing of the sublime Miltonic inflation of the voice, but it is characterised by that sweet sobriety of the verse and that graceful intonation of the voice which shows the workmanship of a mature hand. The mechanism of poetry has been more perfectly handled; the false pace of the verse which is so often noticeable in the *Upahār*, the snip-snap of the couplets which is such an unpleasant feature of the sonnets in the *Dhuli*, all give place to the variegated music of the organ, which though not full-voiced is certainly far from being a mere squeaking instrument in his hands. In the eleventh canto of this book the couplets especially are in masterly cadence; and the run-on verses in many of the lines prevent them from becoming monotonous. Fakir Mohan had a real love for the personality of Buddha and when combined with a mechanical perfection of verse, this resulted in one of the finest poems in Oriya literature. He does not startle us here by any passionate outburst of new-fangled doctrines, but he gives with quiet dignity a graphic account of the sublime life of Buddha. And it is only because there was in his heart of hearts an intense love for the calm personality of Buddha that his poem becomes so appealing.

But it is in his prose fiction that his genius shines forth in its full power. The didactic vein of his poems is no longer prominent, and the humour which he scrupulously repressed in his poems gets free play in his novels. Many of his short stories are masterpieces of literary art and hold the interest of the reader from the beginning to the end. Most of them are characterised by a witty satiric vein, a detailed delineation of human frailties, and a deep insight into human psychology which is unmatched except by a few Bengali authors. They present before our eyes those common activities of men with which we are all more or less familiar and they please us by the exuberant fancy and witty realisms of a master satirist. The medicines which he prescribes for a

faithless husband, the pathetic end which (according to him) inevitably awaits the snobbish coxcombs of the new age, the magnanimity of the widow's son and the saucy petulance of the excise Chowkidar, all have their share in capturing our fancy and all succeed in amusing us by their humour. His command over ordinary colloquial terms, his mastery over the homely expressions which we use every day, make his writings loved by the common people.

His longer novels suffer somewhat in comparison with his short stories. They are all stories, pleasant and powerful, but they can never be regarded as gems of art. He was not the father of the Oriya novel, for there existed at least two novels before Fakir Mohan wrote his *Chhaman Athgunth.* But he was the first Oriya novelist who attempted to delineate the inner life of the true Oriya home. He was perhaps the first man who raised to a literary dignity the daily speech of the ordinary Oriya workman. In his novels there are very often these admirable sketches of individuals which are masterpieces in their way, but as sustained narratives his novels leave much to be desired. They are most of them plain and simple tales, undignified by any noble human interest and sometimes they present before us a number of characters loosely strung together by a series of loosely connected events. They are never deeply interesting, nor is there any sustained working out of any particular theme. Sometimes he portrays a character in some detail in the beginning, only to dismiss him unceremoniously towards the middle.

His defects are seen at their worst in his *Chhaman Athgunth*, but here also we see the stamp of his genius. The story here is extremely slight, for the bad end of a clever and oppressive Zamindar is too common an event in Orissa to draw special attention. The author has shown the worst possible taste in trying to explain his own witticisms to his readers and he attempts to make us understand what is the best method by which milk may be had from a cow, and he has

given a long syllogistic argument to prove that *Asuradighi* contains fish. He apologises again and again for his digressions and make his case worse by these repeated digressions. The character of Champā was a favourite with Fakir Mohan and he brought in the clever maidservant again and again in his other novels. The dénouement of the plot is so sudden that the end seems to have been reached long before the book comes to an end.

His other novels also suffer from most of these defects. Only in his *Prāyaśchitta* he shows greater unity in the weaving of the story and also a repression of unnecessary witticisms. The character of Saila is very admirably drawn and the fortunes of the young lover are carefully handled. The crisis comes in the twenty-first chapter but the strings of the plot are so admirably held that the end can scarcely be guessed. The young lover passes through curious adventures, and the romantic audacity that he displays certainly serves to hold our interest to the very end. The concluding chapter of the book deals with strange psychology and this constitutes, perhaps, the only defect of the book. This portion certainly seems to be drawn out to greater length than is absolutely necessary.

We have pointed out some defects in the novels of Fakir Mohan, but they possess excellent traits of a special kind. They cannot certainly be counted among books of universal interest, but their relative value in Oriya literature is very great. The style in which they are written is inimitable. Many of the sketches with their racy humour are certainly masterpieces of art. The style of Fakir Mohan had nothing of the elevated dignity of Madhusudan nor did it ever degenerate into buffoonery of Gopal Praharaj. On the one hand it could easily express the light thoughts of a common man and on the other it could easily give expression to the deep feelings of our soul. Only a few decades before him Bichhander Pottanaik wrote in that flippant style which no Oriya can read to-day

without a sense of pity for the miserable state of the language of that period. Only about fifteen years back the people of Orissa did not know what prose style was. The syntax of the language was in the melting pot. No style has been so appealing to the masses of Orissa, no syntax has been so flexible and no expression so graceful as that of Fakir Mohan. He used homely phrases, he expressed his thoughts in the plainest and the most ordinary speech and yet his prose style has a lucidity and grace, a dignity and quiet beauty of expression, and withal a stinging and dry humour, all of which just combine to make it so charming. In his writings the psychology of the characters is clearly revealed and the persons whom he depicts became real flesh-and-blood, men and women whom we daily encounter. The style of Fakir Mohan is extremely graphic and vivid and it is its main charm.

After all he was one of the great authors of Orissa, whose lot it was to be pioneers in the field of Oriya literature. The age of the amorous ditties and of pedantic poetry had long been past. Rādhānāth and his contemporaries drew their inspiration from English literature. Oriya authors were for a long time not sure of the ground they were treading. It is to the lasting glory of Fakir Mohan that when the age of new literary experiments came, he was among the small group of writers who worked whole-heartedly for the regeneration of Oriya literature. What time will say of his writings is of course yet unknown. But in Oriya literature he is ever sure of a high position.

MODERN BENGALI LITERATURE; A STUDY OF ITS GROWTH AND OF ITS CHIEF FEATURES

SASANKA MOHAN SEN, B.L., LECTURER IN BENGALI,
UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

The year 1859 is most memorable in the history of modern Bengali Literature. It saw the close of the career of Īśvarchandra Gupta, who united in himself the *Kabi-wālā* of Bengal with the spirit of Dryden and Pope, the twin guardian angels of English poetry of the 18th century. In this memorable year was published also the *Tilottamā Sambhav* of Michael Madhusudan Dutt. Thus the year 1859 marked, in a manner, the ringing out of the old and the ringing in of the new.

Bengal never lacked sweet-voiced singers, some of whom may hold their own amongst the greatest of their kind of all nations. These were Chaṇḍīdās and Vidyāpati, the twin harbingers of the dawn, who sang of Divine Love in guise of the human, who, with their precursor Jayadeva, might be said to have begun the great Vaishṇava movement in Bengali Literature. This was a movement which gave its present shape to the Bengali language and elevated it to the full competency of voicing all the varying moods and attitudes of the human heart. This movement generated Chaitanya, a typical Bengali, who has been allotted by his countrymen, a pedestal of sanctity equal to that of the Ṛishis of old and who has verily been worshipped as an incarnation of the

Divine by a great section of believers. It was also this movement initiated by Chaitanya, which remoulded and gave its present shape to Bengali society out of the chaos resulting from decaying Buddhism on the one hand, and from the incursions of Mohamedanism on the other. There were, beside, Krittivās and Kāśidās, to select only two names out of a great number of the less prominent writers, who were the proud inheritors of the Indo-Aryan culture. It was they, who fully awake to the first glimmerings of the dawn in the life of the common people, which was to lead them ultimately to the day of a separate national entity, echoed the great Rishis with "full-throated ease". They translated into the moving vernacular the great *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, which contain the very essence of Indian life, which throb as it were with the very heart-beats of the Indo-Aryan race. These mighty epics have found their position as indispensable religious books in every Hindu household and form permanent links connecting the past, the present and the future, alike in the domestic, social and economic life of Bengal in all its varied phases and at every stage of its growth. And, last though not the least, there were Mukundarām, the great poet-painter of the rural life of Bengal, Bhāratchandra the greatest word-painter in the Bengali Language, who died only three years before the battle of Plassey, and Rāmprasād one of the most sincere and most truly God-intoxicated Psalmists of all times. These three were the creations of the Great Śākta movement of India to which the Bengal has become a willing votary. Neither the Śākta nor the Vaishṇava movement ever lost sight of the light of Aryan culture. Bengali Literature was thus by no means an 'inert subject', when it was fated to receive the influence of Europe. It received it, however, not on terms of willing equality, but as the despised mother-goddess of a subject race.

Bengali mentality was never closed to the development of prose also. Prose is of later growth in all modern

literatures; and in spite of the glorious examples of its development in the classical language, Bengal developed plain terse and pointed prose only from the 17th century onwards. It only found a fuller scope for its energies with the advent of the printing press at Serampore. It may be said that but for the religiously militant spirit of the devoted Christian Missionaries of Serampore and elsewhere, Bengali language and literature would not have received that awakening which was necessary for self-preservation and conscious growth. The first year of the nineteenth century saw the establishment of the Fort William College where the Bengali Vernacular was given all the advantages of a systematic study and the domain of the language extended to the departments of modern science, literature and law as an indispensable educational measure. One need but say, that Missionary activities against Hindu society and the application of the well-intentioned lancet just at the points where the sore had gathered did memorable service in arousing it into renewed vigour and life. Not long afterwards, the greatest Bengali of the age, Rammohan Roy (1774-1833) came on the scene as the prophet of a new era in literature, in religion, in politics and in education,—in fact, in every branch of the rational life of Bengal. Bengali prose though rugged and crude till that time, became in his hand a potent instrument; and, like a true hero and champion, he wielded it successfully both for attack as well as for defence. The dynamic energy of our vernacular was for the first time wonderfully proved in his exposition of philosophy of the Upaniṣads, the Tantras and the Purāṇas. In the comparative study of religion and sociology also the redoubtable Rājā might be pointed out as a pioneer. The first half of the nineteenth century was, above all, an era in which the soul of the Bengali people was literally struggling for a further self-expression and self-assertion against a powerful alien civilisation and culture; and the champions of the time were all more or less

marked by a spirit of eclecticism and conciliation, as was but a necessity. The short-lived Madanmohan Tarkālaṅkār (1805-1847), and Īśvarchandra Gupta (1809-1859), the latter a satirist who faced every novelty with withering scorn, were the poetic spirits of the period, aiming at a style remarkable for its perspicuity and correctness. The first, a genial son of the Muses, approximates to the cultured Sanskritic and the second to the native propensities of the mother-tongue. Then came Īśvarchandra Vidyāsāgar (1820-1886) and Akshoykumār Dutt (1820-1891), the twin harbingers of early prose, inspired by the genuine fire of the ancients, whose light is clearly to be marked in the firmanent long after the full burst of the daylight. Marked by purity and brilliance, their path serves as a guide even to this day. Opposed to these, but of equal worth as stylists stand Pyārichānd Mitra (1816-1886) *alias* "Ṭekchānd Ṭhākur" and Kāliprasanna Sinha *alias* "Hutom Pechā", who take their stand on the vernacular idiom. The educative influence of Dr. Rājendralāl Mitra, who stands immortal in other domains, and Bhūdev Mukhopādhyāy, a genuine Ṛishi-spirit in the study of the social and domestic culture of the country, could never deserve omission in any survey of the literary output of the period. Rāmnārāyan Tarkaratna (1823-1885) was the author of *Kulinkul Sarvasva* (1854) the first original dramatic composition in our literature. Poets like Rangalāl Bandopādhyāy (1826-1887), Kṛishṇachandra Majumdār and Hariśchandra Mitra whose works saw light and found recognition only in the second half of the century, actually united in them the literary style of Persian literature with that of mediaeval Sanskrit; and they stand in bold relief amongst a forgotten host of versifiers of the time. Last of all stands Dinabandhu Mitra (1829-1873) who though making his debut three years after Madhusudan with his far-famed dramatic work *Nīldarpaṇ* (1854), combined in himself the classical and the romantic styles of writing.

Such were the predecessors and contemporaries of Madhusudan, one of the choicest spirits of literature, in whom the soul of a nation breathes the atmosphere of freedom and shakes off all limitations. In spirit he was a descendant of the poets who sang in "the mighty-mouthed organ voice of England". Nearer home, he was the successor of Bhārat-chandra as well as the sweet Vaishṇava singers of old. Thus he was an organic harmony of two spirits apparently utterly divergent! In literature he might be regarded as the most Miltonic poet outside England, a poet of the epic mould whose faults and defects even are marked by an epic grandeur. A modern soul, he simply out of sympathy undertook the theme of another suffering soul under the decrees of an inexorable fate! The *Meghnād*, *Brajāṅganā* and *Vīrāṅganā* reveal titanic struggles of heroic souls in chains. It was his poetic soul impatient of all restraint that goaded Madhushdan alike to shake off Hinduism and the social system of restrained liberties which his forefathers had obeyed, and to free Bengali poetry from the restraint of rhyme. He discovered the power of blank verse when applied to his mother tongue, so that the language of verse instead of moving with a measured pace, was, for the first time in Bengali poetry, freed to move to the tread and measure of the emotions. The mighty heart of the poet gave a mighty rhythm to his verse and made it chime to a music unheard in Bengali before. This rhythmic freedom charmed the heart of the reader and the enchantment and subjugation were complete. It appeared to breathe the very essence of all poetry, a characteristic which no other poet of Bengal has been able even to approach. His poetry, never characterised by any philosophical depth or psychological subtlety, appealed, from the very first, to the reader by its naturalness, its sincerity and its grandeur, and for ever fixed him as "a bright particular star" in Bengali literature.

A kindred spirit was soon to follow. Hemchandra Bandopādhyāy was the next inheritor of this "classic" vein. A soul

from the very first delighting in the *Odes* of Pindar and the Greek classics, he appeared to have drunk deep of the "harmonious springs of Helicon". He commanded a range of intellect and strength equal to those of the ancient masters and a sympathy of heart uncurbed by any bias. To the critic, the mental image of Hemchandra the poet will appear like unto the image of Dhūrjaṭi, blowing his mighty conch from the heights of Kailāsa, a spirit only austere and rigid in appearance but concealing in the mighty folds of his *jaṭā* the stream of the soul-purifying Gaṅgā—the drink divine of the Gods. Hemchandra, though his classic strength and bare simplicity differ essentially from the romantic profuseness of imagery exhibited by Keats, might be said to have wrought a sequel to the latter's fragment of Hyperion in the spirit of the original. His struggling and enquiring spirit which is ever on its upward flight to attain the unattainable and to know the unknowable! There is this heroically aspiring spirit in his *Āśā-kānan*, this irreverent enquiring spirit in the *Chāyāmoyī* and *Daśa Mahāvidyā*, wherein the poet is a close kindred of Dante, "the pacer on the shore". And it is ever the spirit that is ultimately struck blind by a lightning from the Beyond! There is this heaven-insulting and heaven-conquering soul in his titanic Vṛitra, who in the course of his sacrilegious expedition and advance does not lose his hold and balance, and when hurled down in crushing damnation brings down systems with him—a fall truly commensurate with the magnitude of the ambition and egoism that inspired him.

A third, Nabinchandra Sen, was to complete the grand epic trio of our literature. Madhusudan and Hemchandra seemed to have exhausted the supernatural machinery of epic poetry. Nabinchandra was to strike out a new path for himself. Essentially Byronic in the personal element and in the volcanic fire and lava-flow of his rhymes, Nabinchandra possessed also the historic sense and sympathies of Byron.

Viewed in his light, history is the epic of the destiny of nations. National destiny was studied as result of man's action or inaction in history. To the modern mind Politics appears as Religion; and to him the State is becoming what "God" meant to the ancients! Losing hold of the state is not only losing liberty—which under the conditions of Indian society could never mean any great loss—but now it means loss of everything, virtue as well as happiness—nay, of one's very existence. European civilisation, and the European ideal of the State and of Imperialism, have brought the ideals of human life to this pass! So that no nation that hopes to continue on this globe, can now do without following the ideals of Europe, and without looking to politics as the very religion of modern man. National liberty is now synonymous with national existence! One mistake, so to say, on the part of a nation, may bring about almost unimaginable misfortunes in both the outer and the inner life of the individnal, and may almost mean everlasting damnation. Motive facts in the tragedy of the destinies of nations form the untiring theme of Nabinchandra; and he has his own way of dealing with them. To him this destiny is an outcome of conflicting personalities and always implies a personal responsibility. Both the *Palāśir Juddha* (*Battle of Plassey*) and *Rañgamatī* deal with such a tragedy and responsibility. This theme naturally led the poet to an effort at a song of nation-building and with significant results. The history of literature can show but few such instances. He sang of our fall in the foregoing poems, and next he sang of a Paradise Regained after a Paradise Lost. The *Raibatak*, *Kurukshetra* and *Prabhāsh* are three mighty poems that are but three cantos of one epic; the composing of these engaged more than twenty-five years of the poet's life and the attempt was crowned by a splendid success. How could a New India be built out of the chaotic present, out of the debris of conflicting religious faiths and racial antipathies? This question

led this highly imaginative poet to a reading of the past, with a view to give us some data, and bring us a hope that history might but repeat itself. With that aim in view, the ancient history of the *Mahābhārata* was studied over and over again, with an amount of historic imagination and insight of which there is no parallel, until at last Ancient India, glorious and great, stood revealed to the gaze of the superb dreamer! This led to a new and constructive exposition of the *Mahābhārata*, to a fresh interpretation of the forces that inspired the movements of that great Aryan Epic, and thus was produced the grand trilogy of Bengali literature that has aptly been called "the *Mahābhārata* of the nineteenth century". In the history of Indian literature this will be remembered as the fourth adaptation of the *Mahābhārata* and its transformation in accordance with the Vaishṇava spirit, with its fundamental ideal of "one Religion, one Nationality, one God"! The poet nobly imagined and fondly believed himself to have opened to a fallen people the only path of hope and salvation. And it is a magnificent story of hope, magnificently told.

Thus our Madhusudan, Hemchandra and Nabinchandra, stars of the very first magnitude, shine forth in Bengali literature with a light unborn of "common life". They are destined to shine out for all the future ages, for ever beyond the reach of vulgar imitators and third-rate emulators. They are perennial fountains for those who thirst for the noble classical spirit, as also for high romance and symbolism in literature. Spirits like these purify the soul by their very breath and even their faults and failures are not without a mark of distinction. These three are representatives respectively of the Śākta, the Śaiva and the Vaishṇava elements of our national culture. The very tone and style of these poets creates an atmosphere that means freedom to the soul from its earthly fetters, a freedom,

moreover, which is the conscious or unconscious goal of all the "pilgrims of literature".

There was still left an almost untrodden field for a fourth. The lyric is pre-eminently the literature of modern democracy; it is poetry with an excited personal bias; in other words, it is the poetry of modern individualism. It is poetry of the effusions of personality in all the throes of its passions, with all its moral and intellectual predilections. It is alike the poetry of the spiritual hankering of man for the Impersonal or the Unknown. In consequence, this poetry mainly turns upon the pivot of the first person. An attitude which amounted almost to a sacrilege to the ancients—to ancient India particularly, has been receiving the sovereign homage of the moderns. To speak of the "I", to speak in the first person, *in literature!*—it was to our ancestors the height of indecorum, that aroused one's sense of self-assertion or pride, that opened a secret door which led to hopeless darkness! It could have been allowed only in the devotional attitude where the devotee happened to be self-consciously presenting himself at the feet of his Lord, which ultimately led to the negation or absorption of this separated self. In every other case it was regarded as the straight road to spiritual damnation. And here too we may note the old heroic ideals are given the go-by, and every individual is taken as a hero in his own sphere. The attempt at large effects with large symbolism is consequently given up, and people are bent on seeing the infinite, if they can, in the minute speck of individuality. I need not dwell upon the modern lyric in all its subtle distinctions, all the world over. Suffice it to say, that it is poetry of temperament and manner, which varies according to the varying moods of the singer, and may be both with or without any form whatsoever. Now, this field was reserved for Rabindranāth Tagore to win, and win at the same time from the hands of sympathetic Europe the laurel-wreath for Bengali Literature.

Rabindranāth seldom soars up to the height of his subject. In a truly modern spirit, he ever keeps nearer to the earth, but his music often soars far beyond our common ken, and seems to lift the soul farther and farther into the infinite! Is this not oft-times the common fate of all idealists in literature who do not care to keep the body and the soul together; who do not care to choose a high subject or spend a thought on the nobility of his themes ? But above all Rabindranāth is a lyricist and one of the supreme lyricists of all time. His is a spirit essentially different from that of Shelley, the "Sun-treader" of Browning, though, in the early years of his apprenticeship he imitated Shelley in his *Kabi* and other poems now allowed to glide out of print. He, likewise, while still very young, imitated Byron in his *Banaphūl* and Goethe in *Prakritir Pratiśodh* and finally gave up both his models as essentially alien to his spirit. He turned nearer home and echoed to Vidyāpati and Chaṇḍīdās in his *Bhānusinha* and gave a collection of lyrics which finds admirers even now, and which he is not ashamed to own. No doubt, he found kindred spirits in these, and his poetry has retained a Vaishṇava cast ever since, though he is spiritually only a *Bāul* and far from a true Vaishṇava Poet. It was however his *Kaḍi O Komal* which first introduced the artist in Bengali poetry. The sonnets of this small volume reveal a poet sensuous in tone, but highly meditative and rather intellectual in aim. Volume followed volume, not appealing, it is true, so much to the heart as to the intellectual sentiments of man; and they were all of such rapturous and enchanting music as is seldom to be found in literature. This sensuous and erotic rapture and bird-music, this intellectual emotion and thirst after intellectual beauty, this philosophical but voluptuous longing for the Infinite—these have been the paramount marks of all his poetry from this time forth. All his poems and songs, from *Mānasī* up to the latest that bears a name,

and all the hundreds of lyrics without any name at all show us a poet of subtle psychological moods and hair-splitting distinctions, sometimes showing only a distinction without any difference. All these are marked by a sweet flow of ever new rhythms which are all his own. They all show an artist who looks at life from his own angle of vision, one the strings of whose heart have not perhaps learnt to give their full note, but whose intellect touches other shores and whose music gives one glimpses of what is vainly to be sought in any other poet. Our admiration can grow *ad infinitum* in this direction.

As a living poet, who, though well on in sixties, still exhibits a growing mind, it is extremely difficult to safely predicate anything about him. The great mass of his productions must be carefully sifted and their values ascertained before an opinion can be hazarded from the comparative standpoint without encountering the accusation of false patriotism. Here is an artist intensely modern, in other words European, in his manner. Here is a genius of temperament as well as of manner, and an artist of mental impressions, who is not led by any guiding spirit from within, but simply "lives and moves and has his being" in the impressions of the moment. Need I say, that there is, consequently, a want of spiritual unity or proportion in the apparently unlimited output of his pen, which he has manipulated ever since his twelfth year ? The student will probably be always at a loss to discover any subjective law in this mass, except perhaps the truth that it is all the work of a man who has kept his mind as a mirror, open to all impressions of nature, a man who is susceptible to all the varying moods produced by observation or study, one who has made it his aim to write or sing of such impressions. Perhaps it is this sense of the beautiful in all sense-impressions and thoughts, rather than any dominating sense of the true or the good, which shines out as unity amidst all the

diversities of this superb artist of world-wide fame. However, is not this worship of the beautiful more or less the *sine quâ non* of all poets? And the student of comparative literature, who can compare many original minds shining in their original lustre, will perceive here the hand of a giant, though, of a very amiable giant with extraordinary delicacy of touch, before whom all criticism must stand waiting for a long time to come.

To the sympathetic reader Rabindranāth will appear as one of the choicest spirits of poesy, who has been nurtured in modern Bengal amid the infinite delicacies of modern culture, one of the greatest lyrical geniuses of all time, with an immense output, unique in quality as well as quantity; one of the greatest manipulators of short stories brilliant with all the qualities that illumine his lyrics; an idealist philosopher with a pre-eminently poetic charm of style and diction, who thinks in similes and metaphors and is guided by them to their logical conclusions; an inspiring essayist who has lately taken to the Maeterlinckian method of symbolising in the dramatic style; and lastly, a writer of domestic fiction (essentially a European art, but now naturalised in Bengal) depicting sex-psychology with a sureness of touch equalled only by the greatest writers. We can proudly invite the world to examine his achievements in all these departments.

Rabindranāth, who himself stands in Bengal as the immediate spiritual successor of Behārilāl Chakrabarty, a lyrical poet of the sensuously meditative vein, and his own elder brother and sister, Dwijendranāth Tagore and Swarṇakumārī, has a large following in Bengal, both in poetry and prose. The "Rabindra School" includes literary workers, good, bad and indifferent, whose presence cannot be ignored in modern Bengali literature. There are sweet-voiced singers who are remarkable for nothing beyond thair mere sweetness, and who often do not even show any mental power

worthy of remark. These are too numerous to claim a mention in this essay. But they, even in their weakness, show a tendency which is predominant in the language and which is a common heritage of the nation; Bengali literature can put forth an ambitious claim in the field of lyrical poetry. The Bengali mind has cultivated the gift of song for eight centuries and has brought to perfection a species of its own that may be called the *Bengali Lyric*, unique in meditative softness and melody among the lyrical literatures of the world. The immortal Jayadeva of the 12th century, a typical Bengali, first showed this unique vein for sensuous softness and melody even in Sanskrit, a dead language, which had been so completely buried under the rules of the grammarians. Our beloved Vaishṇava and Śākta lyricists of old were, each of them but the spiritual issue of Jayadeva, and in themselves they exemplified to the full the power of the language and showed the line along which it was destined to excel. The Bengali has shown his genius for poetry particularly in his devotional songs and religious rhapsodies. Even the orthodox religious song, which is, as Matthew Arnold says, generally marked by poetical sterility, has developed a poetry of devotion in the *Brāhmo Sangit* and in the Śākta and Vaishṇava songs of Bengal, which is vainly to be sought for elsewhere, and which, at last, gained the admiration of Europe as "mystic poetry" in the *Gītānjali* of Rabindranāth. This same lyrical spirit underwent a notably modern renaissance in Madhusudan's *Brajāṅganā*, in the patriotic odes of Hemchandra and of Nobinchandra, in the beauty-entranced note of Behārilāl, as also in the erotic raptures of Rāmnidhi Gupta. Rabindranāth is but the eclectic result and culminating point of this lyrical renaissance, which is rather discouraged as a fault among his followers. The national mind has undergone a change; and the supra-mundane sentimentality and the erotic softness of the Rabindra School can no longer entirely satisfy us.

Bengali prosody, which attained the limit of its classical expansion and finish in Bhāratchandra was given a romantic turn by Madhusudan, who introduced and brought to inimitable perfection the blank verse, the sonnet and the *otta rima* of Italy. This romantic rhythm also appears to have reached its culmination in the thousand and one combinations of Rabindranāth and his School, notably in one of his followers, Satyendranath Dutt.

A fresh note, however, was added to our lyric poetry by Dwijendralāl Roy, himself a star of great poetic brilliance, in his comic songs and legends and in the renowned soul-stirring music of his patriotic verse. Dwijendralāl, who was a remarkable personality, was too strongly individual to be subdued by the influence of Rabindranāth, and he also was a powerul dissenter in words and as well as in deeds from the ways of the so-called Rabindra School. Though not an equal of Rabindranāth either in subjectivity or in self-examination and introspection, he has shown himself a better hand at creation and construction, and has given us two passion dramas of considerable literary merit. Eventually he became a dramatic writer for the popular stage, and here he gave his patriotic sentiments full play. He might be said to have become a great reformer and instructor of the public in the field of drama, which before him was in sole possession of mere playwrights like Rājkṛishṇa Ray, Manmohan Bose, Giriśchandra Ghose and others though they possessed considerable realistic merit. But Dwijendralāl did not live to see the "year which brings the philosophic mind" and his literary genius must be admitted to have suffered a great detriment owing to his connection with the popular stage, just as Rabindranāth's genius has suffered considerably from his unbroken connection with periodical literature and propagandism ; though in both cases it ultimately turned to the benefit of the people,—a fact that may give us some satisfaction.

Here opportunity may be taken for adding a word or two about our national stage. The drama which was given a good start in both tragedy and comedy by the renowned Madhusudan has not yet developed to the full extent of its possibilities at the hands of either of the playwrights mentioned above or of Dwijendralāl, Rabindranath or Kshirodprasād, though all three are powerful dramatic writers. So that Bengali drama cannot stand comparison with the Elizabethan drama in England.

Among minor poets, Govindachandra Roy, Īśānchandra Mukerjee, brother of Hemchandra, Dwijendranāth Tagore, Surendranāth Majumdār and Swarṇakumārī Debī are all marked by an originality, which, however, did not reach its fruition. Ānandachandra Mitra was an inheritor of Madhusudan's verse and Jogendranāth Bose follows the historic spirit of Nabinchandra Sen. Govindchandra Dās, though on a line with Nabinchandra, was a lyric poet of great originality, and drew his inspiration from the soil, independent of any direct touch with western education. He has had followers in Mānkumārī Bose and others. Satiśchandra Roy and Balendranath Tagore both died young and left us lasting regrets for their promises unfulfilled; the first was remarkable for his enraptured meditations and the second for his sensuous mediaevalism. Dineshchandra Bose was remarkable for his sincere heart. Akshoykumar Boral, Girindramohinī Dāsī and Kāminī Roy show an early divergence from the Rabindra School, tending towards an independent individual development. Rajanikānta Sen followed a middle course between Rabindranāth and Dwijendralāl in his songs; Debendranāth Sen stands on a mid-line between Nabinchandra and Rabindranāth in his lyrics; and Bepinbehāri Nandi follows the patriotic spirit of Nabinchandra and Dwijendralāl in his poems. These bring us down to a host of living singers, whose careers are still open before us, and who have not yet justified their existence enough to lay a claim to any mention in literary history.

II

To turn to the other branch of Bengali literature, namely, Bengali prose: we have observed how Rāmmohan Roy, father of the prose literature of modern Bengal was followed by Vidyāsāgar in his purity and classical polish, and by Akshoykumār in his strength and scientific outlook on life. We have also noted, how "Ṭekchānd" and "Hutom" stood at the other extreme. The influence of the other side of Kāliprasanna Sinha's personality as a classical writer and translator of the *Mahābhārata*, and of Hemchandra Bidyāratna as translator of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, cannot also be ignored. *Baṅgādhip Parājay* by Pratāpchandra Ghose, was the first historical romance in our literature. Bengali language was greatly enriched by the direct or indirect spiritual descendants of Rāmmohan; and in this connection the work of the young and unthinking mutineers against the Hindu society and Hindu religion, commonly known as "young Bengal", cannot be minimised by history. Madhusudan himself was one of the "young Bengal" group and even Rāmmohan might be regarded as the forerunner of the lot. But, it was really these young people who first brought the divine fire of genius to bear upon Bengali prose and poetry. Madhusudan's prose dramas, *Sarmishṭhā*, *Padmāvatī* and *Kṛishṇa Kumārī* (the last particularly) first proved to the Bengali the latent life and force in his vernacular; and the activities of the great reform leaders of the Brāhmo Samāj (a movement started by Rāmmohan) namely, Debendranāth Tagore, Rājnārāin Bose and notably Keśabchandra Sen greatly enriched Bengali prose. It was the eloquence of Keśabchandra which first transformed the mere vernacular into the chaste thrilling and masterful medium for communicating thoughts. Keśab was closely followed by Bengal's greatest prose artist of the nineteenth century, Bankimchandra Chatterjee (1838-1894).

Possessed of keen insight into the human mind and a keener one into the very heart of the Bengali language, this powerful writer was the virtual master of Bengali prose for the twenty years preceding his death in 1894. He was a great writer of fiction, imaginative, historical and domestic; was alike an essayist and critic; and he also touched the fields of sociology and of religion. He was the most conspicuous writer of the Hindu revival, set going from the days of Rāmmohan Roy. This revival was really begun by the two master minds of the reform camp, namely Rāmmohan and Keśabchandra, in the *jñāna* (knowledge) and *bhakti* (faith) side respectively of our culture. It was Keśab who first attempted an explanation of Hindu symbolism and gave a modern interpretation of the lives and teachings of Śri Krishna and Chaitanya in his inspiring sermons and lectures. Keśab's suggestions were worked up by his disciple Gaurgobinda Roy in his *Krishna's Life and Teachings*; and this trend was followed by orthodox Hindu leaders in the pulpit as well as in literature, and was turned more or less to orthodox necessities. The movement reached its culmination in the *Dharmavyākhyā* of Shashadhar, in the installation of the Rāmkṛishṇa Society, in Bankim's renowned *Exposition of Krishna* and in the epical Trilogy of Nabinchandra.

Bankimchandra, born in the same year with Hemchandra, was the first graduate of India and was like Madhusudan a sympathetic student of Western literature. He first made his appearance with the historical novel *Durgeśanandinī* (1864) three years after Madhusudan's *Meghnād* and two years after the *Sītār Banabās* of Vidyāsāgar. Though *Durgeśanandinī* was preceded by *Roshinārā*, the work of a young and shortlived writer of great merit, Bankim might be said to be the creator of Bengali fiction and the first artist who formulated its technique in the Bengali language. He also took up journalism and succeeded in bringing the new literature closer to the common life of the people.

Baṅga-Darśan was the "Spectator" of Bengal and bore the impress of the mind of its editor bent on making a survey of the literary, historical, social and economic conditions of Bengal with the eye of an Addison and a Swift, whom he also greatly resembled in style. Though called to many-sided labours by the necessities of the time, Bankim was prominent in the field of fiction; and his *Kapāla-Kuṇḍalā*, *Kṛishṇa Kānta* and *Ānandamaṭh* are destined to occupy a permanent place in the prose literature of the country. *Ānandamaṭh* seems to contain Bankim's ideal of the adjustment of an organism to its environment. It was the pioneer work of the awakened Indian Nationalism and inspired the patriotic dramas of Kshirodprasād, Giriśhchandra and Dwijendralāl with the last of whom patriotism had become a religion. *Anandamaṭh* awakened a spirit which was not to die. In his later days, however, and notably in *Debī Chaudhurāṇī* and *Sītā Rām*, the propagandist got the better of the artist and showed but the common pitfall into which the Ibsens, the Shaws and the Galsworthys and the social propagandists and problem-hunters of modern European fiction are all falling.

After Bankimchandra Bengali literature advanced rapidly in the domain of fiction. Bankim was followed by Chaṇḍicharan Sen, Rameśchandra Dutt on the historical and social side, and by Tārakchandra Ganguli, Debiprasanna Raychaudhuri and Śivanāth Śāstri on the domestic side of fiction. Svarṇakumārī stood out as the pioneer among women writers in Bengal. Chandraśekhar Mukerjee gained fame as author of *Udbhrānta Prem* (Love run mad)—the Bengali "Sorrows of Werther"; as also did Haraprasād Śāstri as author of the far-famed phantasmagoria the *Triumph of Vālmīki*. In the field of essay-writing and history and philosophy the language made rapid strides in Kāliprasanna Ghose and Jogendranāth Bidyābhushan; in Rājkṛishṇa Banerjee, Chandranath Bose, Prafullachandra Mukherjee, Dwijendranāth Tagore, Rajanikānta Gupta and

others, all of whom made their mark during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Modern fiction we know is an European art that has developed its particular technique under conditions of European society, supplying food to the "sexual instincts of the intellect" of man and primarily offering him or her assistance in the quest of a helpmate. This idiosyncrasy was more or less a foreign element in Bengali society. Bankim succeeded by his unique artistic spirit of creation and adaptation, his sympathetic outlook, by his insight into Bengali character and by an almost dramatic instinct for form and construction. His style was like finely tempered steel, flexible but piercing directly into the heart. And all this was attended by a quaint humour that pricks and amuses at the same time. In spite of many faults he remains the master-artist in prose, who approximated more and more to the vernacular as life advanced, and thus stood opposed to Kāliprasanna Ghose and Jogendranāth Bidyābhūshan, prominent for their Sanskritic predilections.

Bengali prose lay long under the suzerainty of Bankimchandra, when towards the close of the nineteenth century another master appeared in Rabindranāth Tagore with a richly ornate and poetic style of expression. Rabindranāth, though he had his co-adjutors in Śrīśchandra Mazumdar and Nagendranāth Gupta, was also to introduce a new departure in fiction with his masterly psychology and unparalleled insight into the sex-instincts of man. Rabindranāth's later-day novels *Chokher Bāli, Ghare O Bāhire*, and others, though but justly decried for their sexual leanings and propensities towards the Parisian ideals of art, might be said to have deserved their laurels in this branch of fiction. Bankim and Rabindranāth, far more the latter, must be admitted to have opened up a new vein hitherto undetected in Bengali art, inasmuch as the copious supply betrays also a large demand, and novels appear by hundreds every

year and are eagerly devoured by the public, though the vast majority of them are liable to be forgotten almost instantly. After Rabindranāth there are hundreds of fiction writers from the mass, from among whom it is very difficult to make a choice, owing to their very questionable practice of transcribing European books without any avowal of their origin. It is also not an easy task to discover the real gold from all this heap of present-day tinsel and glitter, amidst all this professional and journalistic "boom" and uproar of Bazar advertisements. Time, the inevitable Sweeper, must be allowed to have his merciless course for a considerable while, before one can turn his glance profitably in this direction.

Bengali fiction seems to have advanced with strides equal to those of any literature of modern Europe. Fiction does not want any patronage, it appeals to the public at first hand and is bound to succeed in modern society before any of the other departments of prose. Authorship in history, philosophy and science, and even biography and criticism, needs initial assistance to make a stand. In Bengal neither the state nor the public has been disposed to offer such assistance to scholarship or authorship; hence, in Bengal fiction only has thriven by supplying the primary need of man for fun or amusement. After all, is not fiction in all countries noted as trying to give up its claim of being judged as literature? Has it not been seen to succeed by making the art-ideal a mere secondary concern, by preferring the transient to the eternal verities, by taking up the mere particular rather than the universal, by trespassing into the domain of social propagandism or by merely becoming even realistic photography and hackwork? It thrives by appealing to the masses in these days of mass education, the printing press and journalism. This fiction is but a descendant of the ancient epic and the narrative, perambulating the streets *incognito*, verily in the guise of a day-labourer. It is but the literature of democracy, of sentimental tempests, of idealistic sexomania and of the

"mighty uproar of the heart" put within a nutshell, of the discovery of the epical element and heroism in common life, and even of noble aims without the technicalities of noble art. Be it also said, we are not lacking in writers for working out the dominant ideas of Modernism. There is no paucity of numbers for deification of the sex-instinct, for exposition of the truths of man and nature in the language of sex, subordinating all other concerns of life to this main topic and for following the doctrine, "Liberty and Equality," to its full materialistic conclusions And here, as elsewhere, all this passes by the name of "Beauty in Art." The educative side of modern fiction cannot, however, be denied. It is a necessity, and it is indeed this necessity that has compelled Bengali fiction to wander farther and farther from the permanent ideals of art; hence fiction is but grudgingly allowed a place in the history of literature.

In this crowd of novelists, too numerous to claim individual mention, there are a few who stand apart and who are perceived to possess talent and even genius. Foremost amongst these stands Śaratchandra Chatterjee who, inspite of some regrettable angularities and perversities, may claim to be one of the greatest writers on domestic psychology that this quarter of the century has produced. Master of deep introspection and with a style marked by perspicuity and charm, he lacks the high gifts of construction which may be said to be the general lack of all psychologists throughout the world, and which is bound to detract from their performance and to give their works a lower place (their proper place) amidst the masterpieces of art. Saratchandra though a successor of Rabindranāth in some respects, is his superior in some, and his own master in many others. Though an imitator of Rabindranāth in the labyrinthine yet easy-flowing and mellifluous style, and though a borrower as regards some minor situations of characters as becomes one who is but a follower in literature, he is Rabindra's superior in pathos,

in his conception of the personality and his perception of the distinctive angularities of human nature. Though neither of them are masters of very complex situations, Śaratchandra's characters die hard, fighting for their personalities. In this conception of the personality Śaratchandra has a rare spiritual approach to the greatest dramatist of Europe in the nineteenth century,—Hebel, in whom the renowned Ibsen found a fit master, but who eventually turned out to be only a propaganda-leader of the unliterary concert of bag-pipers of modern European drama. He is perhaps nearer to Hindu Bengal than his esteemed predecessor. Essentially a realist like Rabindranāth, Śaratchandra plays with his subject with the hands of a master like Balzac, and though even his best works are marred by certain idiosyncracies like those of Balzac and even of Rabindranāth himself, he is destined to be a favourite amongst the high and low for a good long time. Amongst the greatest that we can show in this line are however, three ladies from the Hindu zenana Nirupamā Debī, Śailabālā Ghosh and Anurūpā Debī who, though their experience is necessarily limited, are possessed of the subtlest insight which they bring to bear upon our national peculiarities with masterly power. It may be simply said that these writers are better understood of the people than any other writers of present-day fiction.

Bengali literature can also show a very rich harvest of short stories in which again, Rabindranāth is supreme by his cameo-like performances. Nagendranāth Gupta, Prabhātkumār Mukerjee and many others, whom it were invidious to mention before ascertainment of their true worth (which only time can show), have scored a success in this direction.

The pulpit literature of new Bengal is one of the most remarkable that our language can show. The book of collected sayings of Rāmakṛishṇa (the notes of his disciples excepted) is perhaps the most wonderful thing of its kind

among the literatures of the world. They embody the sayings of the unlettered Master of the colloquial, who had also the closest touch with the verities of the spiritual consciousness of man. The pulpit works of Keśabchandra, Vivekānanda, Krishnaprasanna, Pratāpchandra and Śibnāth Śāstri might invite comparison with their compeers in any language. The sermons of Keśabchandra Sen, in his *Jīban Veda* particularly, are glowing with fire from Heaven and show the intense sensibility of all walkers of the Path! Here is a stylist, who does not inspire by his complexities and his flowing periods, but like the spiritual Master of Bankimchandra penetrates straight to our heart and takes possession of it by his intensity and penetration. Rabindranāth's lay sermons at the Śāntiniketan are instances of devotional self-exercise and intense self-introspection before his Lord, which rivet our attention with resplendent imagery of poetic richness and insight. It will be noted that his method and manner foster this attitude and give an original thing in the religious consciousness of New India. Rabindranāth is alike the greatest literary spokesman of the Brāhmo spirit, which itself is but an attempt at compromise or adjustment by New India of her Ancient Spirit with the Soul of modern European culture.

There are excellent works of biography by Śiśirkumār Ghose, Nagendranāth Chatterjee, Mohendranāth Vidyānidhi, Jogendrachandra Basu, and Chaṇḍicharan Banerjee. The *Dichtung und Wahrheit* type of autobiographies by Rabindranāth Tagore and Nabinchandra Sen are excellent ones of their kind. The historical works of Kailāschandra Sinha and Rāmdās Sen of the last century and Akshoykumār Maitra, Rāmprān Gupta, Nikhilnāth Roy, Kāliprasanna Bandopādhyay, Śītalchandra Chakrabartty, Nagendranāth Bose, Rākhāldās Banerjee are also remarkable. Rāmgati Nyāyaratna and notably Dineśchandra Sen have given us excellent histories of ancient Bengali literature;

and appeal for higher criticism of our modern achievement has long begun to be audible, though the critic's view-point is not yet satisfactorily free from contemporary obstructions.

We are afraid we have nothing more to recount with any degree of pride. But, it will be sheer ingratitude not to mention the name of Satyabrata Śāmaśrami, Rāmkamal Tarkālaṅkār, Rameśchandra Dutt, Panchānan Tarkaratna, Kālibar Vedāntabāgish, Maheśchandra Pāl, Joytirindranath Tagore, Nabinchandra Dās and others in the field of translation and expansion of the horizon of Bengali literature.

In the field of philosophy, sociology, comparative religion, comparative philology and popular science, etc., there are remarkable productions from Sir Gurudas Banerjee, Nagendranāth Chatterjee, Sītānāth Tattvabhūshan, Tārakchandra Das Gupta, Chandrakānta Tarkālaṇkār, Pūrṇachandra Vedāntachanchu, Kokileśwar Bhattacharyya, Hirendranāth Datta, Rāmendrasundar Trivedi, Tārākishore Chaudhury, Bepinchandra Pal, Benoykumar Sarkār, Rādhākamal Mukherjee, Bijoyratna Bose and Rabindranāth Tagore, Bijaychandra Majumdār, Vidhuśekhar Śāstri, Jagadānanda Roy and others. But it must be said that Bengal, the home of the world-famed Navya-nyāya, has not yet been able to found an original school of philosophy. Bengali prose here is distinctly inferior to what is produced in these departments in the three great literatures of Europe—English, French and German. Bengali philosophical and scientific prose cannot show the strength, the broadness, the distinction and the masterful complexity of manner and expression shown by such galaxy of writers as contributed to a production like the eleventh edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.. The literary level which has been attained by these three first rate modern languages has not yet been reached, we are sorely conscious, by our prose. There has been no

great original genius in inventive power, in style or outlook in these departments and we have only been busy in rearranging or cataloguing our inheritance. It will be seen that Bengal lacks a master-mind, who would devotedly apply himself to the task of standing in worthy succession to the line of great writers from Madhusudan Datta to Rabindranāth Tagore. It will also be observed that the work begun by Madhusudan—of engrafting or appropriating turns of idioms or phrases from other literatures into our own and widening the domain of the idiom and vocabulary of our mother-tongue by the help of those found in Sanskrit,—was given up before it had been given a full and proper chance. Before the language reached its full flavour and strength it prematurely turned towards the attainment of delicate and lyrical subtleties to which the greater attention of the literary workers of the nation may be said to have been directed; and we have still-born lyrical poets and tale-writers by the hundred, men who had undoubted talents, and who could have turned their powers to greater advantage to the nation. Though our strength has grown wonderfully on the side of the colloquial, our literary medium often fights shy yet of meeting the complex ideas of modern times and modern modes of expression face to face.

The reason for this is not far to seek. True it is, that genius cannot be manufactured by any process. But the greater portion of the Bengali strength has been engaged elsewhere. The Bengali race has justified its pedigree, has shown no sterility in genius or in talented and earnest seekers after the permanent in any department of life. But, the mother-tongue of fifty million peoples has apparently been doomed to a comparative barrenness by fate—by inexorable fate! Nothing more remains to be said. We have not been framers of our own destinies.

It remains to be added in explanation, that the education system of the country has failed of its direct effect in promoting

the literature of the country; and the mother-tongue of fifty million peoples has shown a growth utterly disproportionate to the labour and money that is being yearly spent for their intellectual development. One may well ask "What have the Bengal Universities done for Bengali literature?"

Be it said, that it was only in the second decade of the twentieth century that a capable and far-seeing intellect and organizing head was found engaged in removing the longfelt grievance. Amidst difficulties and obstructions of all sorts this one person has been endeavouring to convert an examining institution into a teaching body, thereby laying the foundation of national education on a surer basis and scholarship on a sounder pedestal.[1] Even yet the mother-tongue was but grudgingly allotted a place in the seat of national education and learning. A wider prospect, however, has now been opened by the inauguration of Post-Graduate studies in the Indian Vernaculars and the heart of every thinking man has been awakened by what seems to be the dawn of a new era. But at least a decade shall have to elapse before one can perceive any appreciable result in this direction.

All this means, that only partially has the heart of the nation turned to the Vernacular literature and that this labour has been confined so far only within the shadow of the great University of Calcutta. The votaries of Bengali literature were but those who followed their individual bent and who without any hope of reward have been worshipping the despised mother-tongue of a fallen people. Eminent workers among the vernacular writers and poets, in whom the creative impulse could outsoar the disadvantages of the environment, have so far been but the bye-products of our University system. It has been the fate of our Vernaculars so far to

[1] The inspirer of this movement in the Universities of Bengal (and indeed of all India) has, alas, passed away before these lines could be printed. But his inspiration has come to stay and the future alone shall show where it will ultimately lead Bengal.—I. J. S. T

drag on under repression. Formerly it had to hide itself from public view under the ban of Sanskrit, and whosoever handled the *Rāmāyaṇa* or the *Mahābhārata* or the *Purāṇas* in the vernacular was marked out for eternal perdition. The same fate is theirs to-day, but the dominating power in modern times is another. But for the unconquered literary spirit and race consciousness of the Bengali people, the vernacular literature would have been smothered. It has thriven in spite of all disadvantages until it has raised its head high enough in the second decade of the twentieth century to draw the recognition of the whole civilised world.

A bird's eye view of Bengali literature of modern times cannot fail to convince one, that it has been pre-eminently a literature of eclecticism—a literature of self-assertion, the principal characteristic in the civilisation of modern Europe. All the great poets and writers of modern Bengal have, consciously or unconsciously, approximated to this ideal. All the modern literatures of Europe alike bear this character and it is also a truth that they are neither positively national nor universal. It may be said, they are simply European, as opposed to the Indian or Asiatic. European civilisation itself might now be seen to be pre-eminently eclectic, as it assimilates in its own way the achievements of modern science, sociology, comparative religion, international politics and commerce. Our literature could not but be assimilative in the same way as all living literatures of modern times have shown in their growths. But we ought to make it share in full our Indian peculiarities as well. We ought to know that these same peculiarities connote a civilisation and a social religion and spiritual idealism which is amongst the greatest and the noblest ever conceived by the human soul, and that our literature is to stand or fall by these peculiarities alone in the parliament of nations.

The Bengalees feel that they are a great people. A people who could count Jayadeva, Chaṇḍīdās, Vidyāpati, Kabi

Kaṅkaṇ, Madhusudan, Hemchandra, Nabinchandra, Bankimchandra and Rabindranāth in its roll of literature, Chaitanya, Rāmakṛishṇa and Keśabchandra among its prophets; Raghunandan, Rāmmohan and Īśvarchandra among its humanists and reformers, Pratapāditya and Rāmlāl for its heroes, Raghunāth and Jagadīśchandra among its philosophers and scientists, instinctively feels that it is not without a pedigree, and that a greater future is open before it. The Bengalis feel an instinctive fellowship with all peoples that have said or done great things in history and such instinct is shaping their literature and bringing it to a position of equality with the greatest possessed by any nation.

BENDIGANAVALE VENKATACHARIAR.

HIS LIFE AND WORKS.

P. APPAJI RAO, B.SC.,

Lecturer in Kanarese, University of Calcutta.

Venkatachar was generally known as "Kollegal Venkatachar" though his first name was Bendiganavale.* Most members of his family use the initial B. There is a temple of *Garuḍa,* with two *śāligrāmams* as the two eyes, in this place, and this God is their family-deity and hence the name. Venkatachar belonged to the family consisting of six brothers and one sister. Of these only two brothers, the third and the sixth, are now living, one at Bangalore and the other at Haiderabad (Deccan). He seems to have been born at Kollegal in the year 1845. During his infancy the family continued to live in the old aristocratic style, which, however, was gradually disappearing.

In his boyhood the family became poorer, though they had still enough to live a decent life. It may be mentioned that his early days were spent at the small village of Kollegal. His father used to take him every morning to bathe in the Cauvery river which is not very far off from Kollegal; and on the way back he was made to repeat all the three *kāṇḍas* of the *Amarakoṣa.* Besides Sanskrit he was taught Tamil by his elders at home. He did not attend any school so long as he was at his ancestral home.

When his father came to Tumkur and settled there, Venkatachar was sent to a Payal school where he learnt Marāthi and Kannada. After some time he had to come

* In South India the first " name " of a person is that of the village from which the amily comes. —I. J. S. T.

over to Bangalore and manage his own affairs. Being strongly inclined to study he resolved to face all obstruction boldly. It did not matter much if he had to go without the luxury of timely meals or if he had to remain satisfied with eating only fruit as a substitute for one meal. For the sake of a private tuition in the Bangalore Cantonment he had to walk all the distance from the city, a distance of several miles, taking only cold rice and curds for his breakfast. It was in the face of such difficulties that he attended school and learnt Marathi, Kannada and English. Whenever he happened to be at Dewan Narasimhaiengar's place he used to spend his whole time in his library, being too poor to buy his own set of books. This studious habit he continued right up to the very close of his life.

In March 1864 he got a post as "Gumāshtā and Munshi" of the Tumkur District Treasury, when he was barely nineteen. Thirteen years elapsed before he rose to the position of "Judicial Sheristadār and Public Prosecutor" of Nagar Division. In 1884 he was made a third-grade Munsif and had to wait another fifteen years to get to the first grade. Up to his retirement in 1902 he continued to be a Munsif having officiated as a Sub-Judge for a few months at Hassan and Mysore in 1899. From 1884 onwards he exercised the powers of a second-class Magistrate. He does not seem to have taken even a day's leave of absence during the whole period of his service. During all his official life he spent all his spare hours in reading English and other books.

In course of time his circle of acquaintance grew. Two names deserve special mention, because the literary activities of Venkatachar are mainly due to their influence. The first of them was Narayanaiengar, an Assistant Commissioner in the same department in which Achariar was working at Shimoga. He was a good Sanskrit Scholar and a deep philosopher and wrote a famous work on Indo-Aryan Mythology and several other distinguished works which attracted the attention

of the late Lokamanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak and other Vedic scholars. Narayanaiengar went on a pilgrimage to Northern India and visited Bengal. It was the time when the Widow Re-marriage Act had just been passed in the Imperial Legislative Council at Calcutta through the strenuous exertions of the late Pandit Iśvarchandra Vidyāsāgar, the well-known reformer of Bengal. Narayanaiengar was very much impressed with the name and fame of the Pandit and did not miss the opportunity to make the personal acquaintance of the great reformer. On returning to Shimoga he gave a vivid account of the activities and of the strong personality of the famous man and showed a copy of his photo to his colleagues in office. The purity of life and simplicity of manners of the Pandit fascinated Venkatachar and a few others who resolved at once to open up correspondence with this great man. True to his inherent good nature, the Pandit was kind enough to reply at once, welcoming the proposal to keep in constant touch with them. After knowing each other to their mutual satisfaction the Pandit presented a copy of his newly published Bengali Grammar to Venkatachar and requested him to learn Bengali for which he was prepared to help him. Here was something attractive and, moreover, the pupil was himself about to ask for the same favour. Thus for nearly two years the teacher continued to set tasks and correct the exercises of his grown-up pupil. Their relationship was truly that of the ancient type of *Guru* and *Śiṣya.* When the pupil had acquired sufficient practical knowledge of Bengali, a graded system of further study was arranged. The pupil was also introduced, through correspondence, to several other Bengali writers of note and was guided by the venerable Pandit whenever occasion demanded. The *Guru* was also pleased to permit his student to translate all his works into the Kannada language and suggested to him to begin with *Bhrānti Vilāsa,* an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors.*

His second friend Grama Gundappa was a clerk in the Circle Inspector's office at Shimoga. He was not only a Sanskrit and Kannada Scholar but was also a man of poetic tendencies. Venkatachar was indebted to him for many a necessary suggestion as regards the diction and idiom of the Kannada language in his first few translations.

Official duties removed him after a time from the congenial surroundings of Shimoga to Yedahalli where he could not find suitable company. He had to be content with a few pilgrims on their way to Śringerī, the well-known seat of Jagadguru Śankarāchārya. It was here that Venkatachar happened to see and converse for the first time with a Bengali devotee on his way to Śringerī. At his request the traveller broke his journey for a week or so and spent many a happy hour in speaking with probably the only South Indian of the day conversant with Bengali.

The Swāmī of the Śringerī Maṭha had a great liking for Venkatachar. So long as the latter was Munsiff at Yedahalli they used to meet each other very frequently. As Venkatachar knew Sanskrit, it was not difficult for him to follow some of the religious discourses of the Jagadguru. Being in the Judicial service the Swāmī used to consult him in several matters connected with the Maṭha properties, both private and public. The implicit trust of the Swāmī in his friend is shown further by an incident recorded in the annals of the Maṭha. It appears some mischief-mongers stole the image of *Chandramaulīśvara* and hid it somewhere. The Swāmī became anxious and took a vow to starve himself till he regained possession of this precious image and could worship it. It was not till the third night that clue could be obtained. The Swāmī had a dream indicating the place where the stolen article could be found. Instead of revealing the dream to any person in the management of the Maṭha, he called Venkatachar for assistance. He found the Swāmī's dream to be correct and arranged to bring the image back with all honours due

to the sacred Deity. For all these the Swāmī had the highest regard for him and he used to talk of him even to H. H. the Maharajah of Mysore in very respectful terms.

After being transferred to various other places he came to Mysore and lived there practically to the end of his life. He could meet here his old friend and relative V. N. Narasimhaiengar, with whom he would spend some minutes at least every day and enjoy some interesting conversation or a good joke. A half-hour's laughing was, in his opinion, worth a good day's work; many of his stories are very amusing, and reflect the writer's love of wit and humour.

Once Venkatachar was in Pondicherry for the sake of his health and had put up at a bungalow where Swāmī Vivekānanda and his friends were also lodged. It was by sheer chance that they came to know each other. His knowledge of Bengali enabled him to talk to the distinguished man to his utmost satisfaction. They spent about two days in each other's company in that place and came together to Madras where Venkatachar introduced the Bengali Sannyāsin to some of his friends. They were highly struck with the remarkable erudition and scholarship of Vivekānanda and arranged for a few lectures in Madras.

Venkatachar's views had become quite cosmopolitan by study and by contact with Bengali writers and travellers. And he also brought his expanded views to bear on the local social problems. In the year 1872 a member of his own community, Ramaiengar, returned from England after being called to the Bar. A section of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava community desired to out-caste him, whereas others were for receiving him back in their midst after a purification ceremony. Both the parties were equally strong and unyielding with the result the situation was getting more undesirable day by day. At this stage Venkatachar with the connivance of two other gentlemen of the community published anonymously a fine book called *Chiratnanatakaratna* giving a graphic picture of

the existing social condition of the community to which he belonged. To prevent any unpleasantness he took care to tear off the printer's name from each book, before it was sold. There was not a single member in the community who did not in some way or other feel that he was exposed before the general public. Some were highly annoyed but others were highly amused at the writer's ingenuity. The former class attempted to find out the writer and if possible bring him into the clutches of the law. The outburst of indignation, however, gradually gave way to more sober thoughts and the Europe-returned person was taken into the community after the *prāyaścittam.*

Venkatachar's views on education in general, and of woman's education in particular, were equally strong. The atmosphere of the adult girls' schools, which he had occasion to observe closely, made him realise that the type of instruction given to them was not the most suitable. He sincerely believed that western ideas of culture were anything but satisfactory for Indian girls. He was for their advancement and uplift. In fact he never missed an opportunity to address them on the needs of a practical education. "The three R's" were no doubt necessary and indispensable. Indian ideals of womanhood and social service had no place in the curriculum of the modern girls' schools. Most of his works are written with the object of emphasising the need of such ideals. A bare imitation of alien customs and manners meant degeneration and demoralisation. A healthy combination of ancient Hindu principles with a few essential and desirable customs of the West was to be aimed at rather than any erroneous exercise of freedom in thought and action at the sacrifice of the ancient Hindu ways. He spared no pains in this honest attempt and one has to remember that he was the first in creating a healthy public feeling among the women.

His book *Nondnadi* gives a clear exposition of what a man's woes are, to what extent a housewife is free to manage

her domestic concerns, in what direction Hindu customs allow her complete powers for discriminative action and wherein she is complaining about a few restrictions. He warns her how in Western countries the joy of home-life is wanting and how Indians have so far preserved it mainly on account of the very restrictions about which they are complaining. Any move on their part to do away with these would automatically render society as a whole unhappy and miserable.

Several of his works deal with educational problems. His favourite topic was education of women and he did everything in his power to keep his women readers in touch with matters concerning them in various parts of the world. Thus, for instance, he tells them something about the "Suffragist Movement" in England and America. Lord Tennyson's *Princess* is brought out in bold relief in his *Chitravichitrāvalī*. Bankim Chatterji's *Debī Chaudhuraṇī* is also referred to. Another essay reminds them of the respect which ancient Hindus had for women. Examples are given from historical and religious records to emphasise the spirit of sacrifice shown by mothers and wives in order to preserve the manhood of the nation.

It may be mentioned here that many of his critics are disposed to say that these ideas are not original in Venkatachar. No doubt they may have been borrowed, but the critic should not forget that there were no books in the Kannada language to appeal to the masses and his writings have supplied this want. Besides, the sincerity and honesty of purpose with which these modern ideas have been placed before the Kannada-knowing public should disarm such criticism completely. Venkatachar was quite at liberty to choose any topic he liked; the very fact that he devotes much time and attention to a particular subject shows that he was very keenly interested in it.

When any of his works were criticised, the author generally replied to it either by translating a book or by writing a

new one, as was best suited to meet and refute all the arguments of the critic. Such answers were sometimes given with a certain amount of exaggeration in order to maintain his own special point of view. At times he found some little enjoyment by ridiculing his critics. Most of his minor works seem to be more or less a reply to his adversaries. His *Crow*, *Mosquito* and many other essays speak for themselves. An amusing bit of criticism resulted in bringing out *Vaijñānika Prahasana* which shows how an unpractical scientist talks vainly of his theories, sets at naught the prudential advice of his parents and others, and finds out at last that science is not everything in this world. The book also reveals how merely copying European manners indiscriminately results not only in family disaster but also leads to an utter disregard for all sacred scriptures of the past.

The custom of the Śri Vaiṣṇava Brahmanas of South India is to worship Viṣṇu alone, to the total exclusion of the other two of the Trinity. When His Holiness Śrī Swābhinava Sacchidānanda Narasimha Bhārati Swāmī of Śringerī visited Nanjangud, Venkatachar happened to be there and invited His Holiness for the "Pāda Pūjā" ceremony to his house. Such a complement is rarely paid and he further edited and published with the permission of the Swāmī some extempore verses of the latter in praise of the Śāradā. He also published a Sanskrit translation, from the original Tamil texts, of the well-known story of the famous Tamil woman saint Śrī Andal. It is in the form of a prayer addressed to Lord Śrī Krishna and is highly devotional; and it teaches that "unflinching devotion to God is a reward in itself."

After telling us that *Bhagavad Gītā* is a condensed form of the *Upaniṣads*, he proceeds to show how each school of thought interprets the texts so as to suit its own creed; he deplores the undesirable consequences of such a practice, all the more so, on account of the fact that unscrupulous

people justify their daily conduct on the authority of the *Gītā*. In his opinion the three cardinal principles of the *Gītā* are (1) *niṣkāma-dharma-sādhanā*, (2) unqualified devotion to God and (3) *Ātmā-anātmā-bodha*. He dilates upon the first and proves how the present system is worked on quite the reverse principle—boys go to school not with the desire to learn or acquire knowledge but with the object of passing examinations in order to secure worldly prosperity. All this proves that he was a practical man and not simply an idealist; it shows further that his ideas of orthodoxy were not of the same rigid type as those of most of his own community.

In order to understand Venkatachar's literary career, it would be necessary to cast a cursory glance at the period just prior to his birth. It was during the early years of the reign of Śrī Mummadi Krishnarāja Wodeyar Bahadur of Mysore, the grandfather of our present Maharaja, that Kannada printing was first introduced, by European Missionaries; Śrīmān-Mahārāja Chāmarajendra Wodeyar's *Vaṁśaratnākara* mentions the existence of the Ambāvilāsa Press in the Mysore palace. This fact leads one to conclude that printing was introduced there sometime in the first quarter of the 19th century.

The patronage accorded to the literary men was truly Oriental in its lavishness. The late Maharaja was indeed a "Bhojarāja" in miniature; he was a good scholar of both Kannada and Sanskrit and spared neither money, time, nor energy to encourage literature in every form. Special royal sittings were held for discussions in Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa, Vedānta, Mīmāṃsā and other topics with both local and foreign Pandits of ability and distinction. Being fond of books, he gradually amassed an excellent and choice collection of manuscripts on all subjects and named his library the *Sarasvatī Bhāṇḍāra*, a name which it very richly deserved. Unfortunately most of it was consumed by fire when the

old palace was burnt down; but from its ashes arose the present Oriental Library of Mysore.

At this stage two new factors have to be taken into consideration. In the year 1830, the administration of the State passed into the hands of the British Commissioners solely appointed to carry on the Government of Mysore in the name of the Maharaja. Sir Mark Cubbon was the first Chief Commissioner. Within a dozen years, he showed a decided improvement in the State affairs. Indian officers from the Andhra, the Tamil and the Maharastra countries were imported for higher services to preserve the "native character" of the Government. Naturally those who knew Marathi and English languages were selected for the posts, since Marathi and English were both needed in matters of official routine. The advent of these men gave a stimulus to the study of English, doubtless with a corresponding neglect of the Kannada.

The second factor was the activity of the Missionaries of the London Mission, the Wesleyan Mission and the Basel Mission. The first of these is not noted in any way for literary publications, while the two other with their magnificent presses are even to this day rendering a lot of service to the people. The Basel Mission, known after the Great War, as the Kanarese Mission, has done the finest work. It was here that the famous Rev. F. Kittel worked for a number of years and published his *Kannaḍā-English Dictionary*, his *Grammar*, *Chandombadhi* and *Śabdamaṇi-darpaṇa*. The Basel and the Wesleyan Missions have carried out a great deal of translation work in connection with the Holy Bible and the mythological stories of the East and the West and also many other educational publications. They have also been instrumental in the manufacture and sale of Kannada types for the printing establishments throughout the whole of the Kannada country. Educational institutions for boys and girls were started by them on modern lines with the permission and assistance of the existing Governments; the Government

Education Department of the Mysore State was, however, not started till 1856.

One department of the State needs some mention. Under the able guidance of B. Lewis Rice, the ancient relics of Mysore were carefully studied by the Archaeological Department and the results were embodied into suitable volumes, the most important of which are the *Epigraphia Carnatica.* It is this department that has revealed to the public a fund of ancient Kannada lore and is still maintaining its old reputation.

The year 1868 marks a new epoch in the history of the Kannada literature. The old revered Śrī Mummadi Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur died in 1868, quite disappointed at not having been able to realise his dream of handling the administrative machinery himself; and his adopted son, His Highness the late Maharaja Śrī Chāmarājendra Wodeyar Bahadur, had been with some difficulty recognised as the future Heir-apparent. Between 1868-1880, Marathi was gradually replaced by English as the court language. With the loss of royal patronage, Kannada was practically cast aside. In 1881 the Rendition brought many blessings, among the foremost of which was the fostering of Kannada letters and literature by His Highness, a measure quite in keeping with the brightest traditions of the Royal House of Mysore. Its direct outcome was a revival of the Kannada literature. The *Kāvya Kalānidhi* and the *Kāvya Mañjari* Series of the Hale-Kannada Works, and the *Karṇāṭaka Grantha Mālā* Series of Hosa-Kannada Works deserve special note in this connection. The last one is intended for improving modern prose and for giving as much encouragement and assistance as is possible to promising writers of the day. The most recent efforts are seen in the establishment of the *Karṇāṭaka Sāhitya Parishat,* at Bangalore and the *Karṇāṭaka Vidyā Vardhaka Sangha* at Dharwar. Lastly there is the Mysore University itself, one of whose aims is to develop the Kannada

language. Let us hope it will go a long way to turn out a large number of original Kannada writers in every branch of human knowledge.

Now it is to be observed that Venkatachar was himself the editor of *Avakāśa-toṣini* in which he is said to have published many of his minor works. He must have realised for himself no doubt what special efforts were being made to improve the vernacular. Being himself a struggling author, the starting of the Graduates Trading Association and such other private bodies must have been very welcome to him.

It has already been pointed out that at the suggestion and permission of Pandit Īśvarchandra Vidyāsāgar, *Bhrānti Vilās* was translated first. Nearly three years elapsed before it could be completed in 1876. The facilities for getting works printed at that time were not even one-hundredth of what are available to-day; not only was it a question of cost but there was also a lot of delay and worry for people living in the mofussil. In the case of Venkatachar, a friend was kind enough to help him to tide over this difficulty. The style, the treatment and the matter of the book attracted the attention of the public with the result that the Madras University recognised it as a text-book. Prompted by these encouragements, he toiled for another two years more with *Śakuntalā*.

At this time in 1884 he had to suffer the grievous loss of his second wife. Such a heavy loss inclined him to take a philosophical view of man's existence in this world. In this mood, his *Sitā Vanavāsa* helped to relieve him from the care and mitigated somewhat his anxiety of looking after his four motherless children at home. This book was quickly followed by *Bhārata Mahilā* in the same year; both these works are intended specially for women. In the following year (1885) he married again and went on uninterrupted with *Durgeśa Nandini*, the masterpiece of Bankimchandra Chatterjee, who was good enough to permit Venkatachar to translate his works.

During the next few years, there does not seem to have been much literary production though he continued his usual studies. In 1891-92 he edited and published the *Śāradā Stotra Kadambakam* and *Śāradā Stotra Maṇḍala* in commemoration of the visit of the revered Jagadguru Śankaracharya of Śringerī to Nanjungud where he was the Munsif at the time. In 1896 his third wife too was snatched away from him by the cruel hand of death. He was now in his fiftieth year and had yet a few years more of work before retirement from the Government service. The responsibility of looking after the family single-handed became a heavy burden to him. He had as yet produced only half-a-dozen books; and the three works written at this time, *Indirā*, *Nīlā Gītā* and *Ānanda Maṭha* show the state of his mind. These show clearly that the mind of the author had turned more to the other world than to this, although feelings of "patriotism" predominate over the religious sentiment. In many ways his third wife had been a companion after his heart. She relieved him of house-hold troubles, and shared with him his intellectual pursuits. She would read his manuscripts, point out errors if any and correct the printer's proofs. As she was a woman of very warm affections, she had won the esteem of all. The loss of such a wife could not be easily forgotten except by those who have a very strong attachment to some other pursuit, which in his case was his fondness for Bengali books. It was thus at Kolar that he recommenced his vigorous pursuit of translation in 1896, and he pushed on unceasingly and published in 1898 five novels viz., *Rājasimha*, *Rajanī*, *Kapāla Kuṇḍalā*, *Kamalā Kānta*, and *Loka Rahasya* (Part I).

From 1899 to 1902, about thirteen more works were added to the long list of his publications, which at the time of retirement numbered thirty volumes.

He was eagerly waiting for the day when he could free himself from the official yoke and did not hesitate to do so

at the proper moment. A new desire had arisen in his mind—a desire to complete one hundred works before the call came from the other world. In consequence some of his friends used to call him *Vyāsa*, who is said to have written one hundred books in his life-time. Inspired by this noble wish he laboured incessantly and earnestly up till his very death in 1914.

Providence was not merciful and did not spare him to fulfil his long cherished ambition. He could complete only about sixty works at the time of his death. His sons have told the writer that he had selected his subjects and had laid down his plans for the full hundred. The Karṇāṭaka Vidyā Vardhaka Sangha of Dharwar conferred upon him in 1910-11, the title of *Karṇāṭaka Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa* in appreciation of his untiring zeal and energy in enriching and ennobling Kannada Literature by his voluminous and instructive contributions. His children have through his books inherited a mine of really potential wealth. It is gratifying to note that at the noble suggestion of Sir M. Visveswaraya, his second son started a press for collecting and publishing Venkatachar's works, which had been for some time not available to the Kannada public. It may also be mentioned here that in the year 1911, the author himself published his works in a series known as "Narasimharaja Wodeyar Series" in token of deep devotion and loyalty to the Royal family of Mysore.

His strenuous labours, in spite of long years of official drudgery and heavy domestic suffering are an eloquent testimony to his extraordinary desire for literature as also to an equally great strength of purpose in bringing his works to the light of day. It is due to his writings in the early part of the present century that a love for Kannada books—especially novels—was created in the Kannada-knowing public. He has brought home to the young writers of his mother-tongue that they should attempt to imitate the more advanced

Indian Vernaculars (like Bengali) by patient study and critical observation. It is now recognised on all hands that he has contributed in no small measure to the permanent treasures of Kannada Literature.

Defects and faults there are in abundance in his style, but they are necessarily due to circumstances under which he worked. We need not go far to substantiate these remarks. Anybody, who has read some of his works, will understand for himself that the style is somewhat rugged, that there is a large intermixture of Sanskrit words—with a few Bengali ones interspersed—in almost every page of his works and that often the reader's interest is kept waiting by unnecessary flourishes and digressions. But we must remember that there were no suitable models of good prose to guide him in the execution of his works, and that he knew Tamil, and even Bengali, better than Kannada. Venkatachar read Bengali, thought in Tamil and wrote in Kannada. Hence a curious combination of weakness and strength can be seen in his style, though this does not obscure the clearness of his meaning. And above all he has shown by his own example how in spite of shortcomings and errors, one can add his little bit towards the general improvement of one's mother-tongue. With the author's permission, some of his novels were translated from Kannada into Telugu and Tamil. He may justly be compared to those who have made two blades of grass to grow where one grew before. The method of thought opened out by him is now copied by many and most of the periodicals of this day are being flooded with new stories of all sorts after his model.

Many and varied are the opinions about such a man as Venkatachar. Some are pleased to call him a common man, some a pedantic man and some others a mere transmitter of thoughts. There are, however, a few who hold a more reasonable view, but they have formed a minority till very recently. He has found more readers in the Southern

Maratha country than in Mysore. Appreciation and honour too came from that quarter much earlier than from men of his own native land. Let us hope that this narrative, however defective it might be, will go some way towards filling up a gap in the history of Kannada literature and in showing that the work done by Venkatachar, in spite of the times in which he lived and the circumstances under which he worked, was really most remarkable.

VIṢṆU'S THREE STRIDES:

THE MEASURE OF VEDIC CHRONOLOGY.

Dr. R. Samasastri, B.A., D.Lit., M.R.A.S.
Curator, Government Library, Mysore.

THE WORLDS.

The three domains spoken of in the *Vedas* as *Pṛthivī, Antarīkṣa,* and *Divaḥ* are the three astronomical divisions of the celestial sphere corresponding to the Spring, Summer, and Winter seasons, and the two worlds *dyāvāpṛthivī* are the *uttarāyaṇa,* the sun's northern journey and the *dakṣiṇāyana,* the sun's southern journey. This view is confirmed by the following passage of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.*[1]

"The first day is for it this same terrestrial world, and the *spring season also* is this *terrestrial world* ; and the second day is what there is above this terrestrial world and below the air, and the summer season also is that part of it ; and the central day is its air, and the rainy and the autumn seasons also are its air ; and the fourth day is what is above the air, and below the sky, and the winter season also is that part of it ; and its fifth day is the sky, and the dewy season also is its sky : thus as to the deities. Then as to the body : the first day is its feet, and the spring season also is its feet and the second day is what is above the feet and below the waist, and the summer season also is that part of it and the central day is its waist, and the rainy and the autumn season also is that part of it ; the fourth day is what is above the waist and below the head, and the winter season also is

[1] XIII, 6,1,10.

that part of it; and the fifth day is its head, and the dewy season also is its head. Thus *these worlds*, as well as the *year*, and the sacrificer's self, pass into the *Puruṣa-medha* for the obtainment and securing of everything; for indeed, these worlds are everything, and the *year* is everything, and the self is everything, and the *Puruṣa-medha is everything.*"

In the above passage the poet symbolically represents the year of 360 days by the five days' sacrifice, called *Puruṣa-medha* or man's sacrifice. The year of 360 days is divided into five parts, (1) the spring, (2) summer, (3) rainy and autumn, (4) winter, and (5) dewy seasons, and those five divisions are symbolically represented by the five days of the *Puruṣa-medha.* The human body is also divided into five parts, as enumerated in the passage, and these five parts are also identified with the five divisions of the year.

The Tāntric literature is full of these ideas:

The *Saundaryalaharī*,[2] for example, divides the body into six parts, and besides identifying these six parts with the five divisions of the celestial vault, distributes the days of the year among those five parts. In verse 9, the feet of the goddess are identified with the earth, the waist with water, the navel with fire, the breast, with the wind, the part above the breast with the sky, and the middle of the brows with the mind. In verse 14, the 360 days of the year are allotted to these five parts as follows :—

Earth	...	...	56	days or	*kalās*
Water	...	...	52	"	"
Fire or summer	...	...	62	"	"
Wind	...	...	54	"	"
Sky	...	...	72	"	"
Mind	...	...	64	"	"
			360	"	

[2] *Saundaryalaharī*, Mysore Oriental Library edition.

That these *kalās* or rays of the goddess are days, is clearly stated in the *Bhairavayamālā* quoted in the commentary on the above verse. Bhāskarācārya, in his commentary on the *Bhavanopaniṣad* [3] identified the goddess with 216,00 *śvāsas* or breaths, in so many breathings making a complete day, as stated in the *Sūryasiddhānta* and a number of Tāntric works:—

10 *śvāsas* (Babylonian *sor*)	=1	*śvāsa*
6 *śvāsas*	=1	*vināḍi*
60 *vināḍis*	=1	*nāḍi*
60 *nāḍis* or 21,600 *śvāsas*	=1	day.

The same idea is also clearly expressed in the *Ṛgveda* as follows:—

"From his navel came mid-air; the sky was fashioned for his head; the earth from his feet, and from his ear the regions, thus they formed the worlds." [4]

"He (Viṣṇu) causeth, like a rounded wheel, ninety recurring revolutions with four names." [5]

Of these two passages, the first speaks of the creation of the three worlds, earth, air and sky from the feet, navel and the head of Viṣṇu, corresponding to the autumn and spring-summer (with rains) and the winter. In the second passage, the usual order is changed. The ear is divided into four divisions of ninety days each, each day being called a *vṛtta* or circle.

In addition to these three or four divisions of the year, two divisions of the year are frequently spoken of in the *Vedas* as *dyāvāpṛthivī*. The *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* [6] says for example, "For six months, (as they go) hence, the Brahman's *Sāman* should be the victorious chant. The victorious chant is the holy power; for the world of heaven is as it were opposite

[3] *Bhavanopaniṣad*, 253.
[4] X, 90, 14.
[5] I, 155, 6, cf. also, I, 164.
[6] VII, 5, 7.

from hence. When they come thence the Brahman's *Sāman* for six months should be."

From this passage it is clear that the heavenly world (*div*) means six months and the earthly world (*pṛthivī*) which is opposite to it is also the other six months of the year. The other endearing terms applied to these two worlds are mother and father. This is proved by the following passage of the *Ṛgveda*:[7]

"They call him in the farther half of heaven the father five-footed, of twelve forms, wealthy in water-store."

"Beneath the upper realm, above this lower, bearing her calf at the foot, the cow hath risen. Witherward, to what place, hath she departed? Where calved she? Not amid this herd of cattle."[8]

"Who, that the father of this calf discerneth beneath the upper realm, above the lower, showing himself a sage, may here declare it?"[9]

The meaning of the above verses is this: the lower half, *i.e.*, the half from summer solstice to winter solstice, is the mother; and the other upper half, *i.e.*, the half from winter solstice to summer solstice called *uttarāyaṇa* is the father. The mother and father come together at the summer solstice and winter solstice. The mother becomes pregnant and brings forth her calf, the new year, on the summer solstice which is above the lower realm and beneath the upper realm, as stated in the above verses. Now the poet asks himself, saying "when does the old year personified as cow go after presenting her calf, the new year, and how did the father, the old year, come to wed her in the lower realm beneath the upper".

That the summer solstice is the termination or head of the *Puruṣa* or father is clearly stated in the following passage of the *Ṛgveda*:[10]

[7] I, 164, 12.
[8] I, 164, 18.
[9] I, 164, 17.
[10] I, 164, 7.

"Let him who knoweth presently declare it, this lovely bird's securely founded station.

Forth from his head the cows draw milk, and wearing his vesture with their foot have drunk the water."

Evidently the milk referred to here is the water of the midsummer rains. The reason for personifying the years and days of the years as cows, calves or bulls is not far to seek. The poet seems to have been led to this metaphor on the analogy of a calf or new year's day marrying its own cow mother, the old year, to bring forth another calf in its turn. Be the reason what it may, it is clear that they called the days cows, and the winter solstice a bull. As the calf is stated to be brought forth *beneath* the upper world and *above* the lower world, it is manifestly evident that the midsummer was the commencement of the year and mid-winter was the middle. The sacrificial year, on the other hand began with winter solstice, as stated in the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa.*

Each of the two worlds, the earth and the sky, is divided into three minor worlds called earth, air and sky, and one of their characteristics pointing out their arrival and departure is thus stated in the following passage of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* :[11]

"Give me the heaven; give me the air (or atmosphere); give me the earth; give me the earth; give me the atmosphere and give me the heaven; expand with the day and contract with the night; expand with night and contract with the day; increase desire and contract desire."

The order of the enumeration should be particularly noticed here: heaven, air, earth; earth, air and heaven. This shows that the sacrificial year began in mid-winter and passed through spring, summer, autumn in the middle, and autumn in the other half, then air, and first half of winter

[11] III, 10, 4.

terminating with the winter solstice. After winter solstice the days begin to get longer and longer and nights shorter and shorter until they become equal at the vernal equinox; and after that the days become longer than nights, till at the summer solstice the day becomes the longest and the night becomes the shortest. Again onwards the days contract and the nights expand till they become equal at the autumnal equinox, after which the nights become longer than days till at the winter solstice the night becomes the longest. This is what is meant by the expansion and contraction of days and nights spoken of in the passage.

The division of a year into six worlds, *i.e.*, half a year into three worlds, is still more clearly set forth in the following passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* :—[12]

" He who desires heaven should use two *anuṣṭubhs*. There are sixty-four syllables in two *anuṣṭubhs*. Each of these three worlds (earth, air, and sky) contains (three) twenty-one places, one rising above the other (just as the steps of a ladder). By twenty-one steps he ascends to each of these worlds severally; by taking the sixty-fourth step he stands firm in the celestial world. He who having such knowledge uses two *anuṣṭubhs* gains footing in the celestial world."

This is enjoined in connection with *Sviṣṭakṛt* offerings made in *dīkṣaṇīya* sacrifice. The verses recited while making the offering may be in any meter, and the sacrificer desirous of reaching the heavenly world is asked to recite two verses in the *anuṣṭubh* meter. The reason for the selection of this particular meter is explained in the above passage. The distance of the heavenly world from the terrestrial world is three times thrice twenty-one, *i.e.*, $3 \times 63 = 189$ and the last step of heavenly world is the 64th. This implies that the same three worlds in descending order will contain $3 \times 63 = 189$ steps, making a total of 378 steps. The god of the first step

12 I, 5.

of the terrestrial world is Agni and the god of the last step of the heaven world is Viṣṇu. This is what is meant by the statement made in the beginning of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* that " Agni has the lowest and Viṣṇu the highest place among the gods." Here the number 378 denotes the days of a cyclic year with 360 ordinary days and 18 intercalary days. As usual with the Vedic poets. The author of the *Aitareya* has placed nine of the 18 intercalary days before and the remaining nine after the central day called Viṣṇu. Since we know that the *Savana* year of the Vedic poet was a year of 360 days and that the solar year was of 366 days, the cyclic year with 18 intercalary days must necessarily be a third year. This is borne out by the following passages of the *Nidāna Sūtra* :[13]

"Who knows that *Parivatsara* in which no solar month, or lunar month, or even the *nakṣatra* month remains without completion. In that year which consists of 379 days neither the solar, nor the lunar nor the *nakṣatra* month remains without being completed. In that year the sun goes to the south for 27 periods of seven days each and to the north for a similar period. The sacrificer should insert 9 days before the central day and nine days after the central day in the *sambharya* months, *i.e.*, the sixth and the seventh months."

The beginning of the year with *dakṣiṇāyana* deserves particular notice. Accordingly the central day is the winter solstice day. The number of intercalary days is 18, of which nine are added before and nine after the central day. The word *viṣuvān* for the central day does not mean equinoctial day, as it does in modern works of astronomy. Hence it goes without saying that the year observed consisted of 360 days and that it was adjusted with the solar year of 366 days by adding to the former 18 days in every third year, with the object of terminating the three months, the solar month of 30½ days, the lunar of 29½ days and the nakṣatra month of 27⅓ days

[13] V, 12.

at the same time. Now three solar years of 366 days each contain $3 \times 366 = 1098$ days. Dividing this by $30\frac{1}{2}$, the number of days in each solar month as stated in the *Nidāna Sūtra*, we have $1098 \div \frac{61}{2} = 36$ full solar months.

Similarly dividing the same by $29\frac{1}{2}$, the number of days in each lunar month, as stated in the same *Sūtra*, we have $1098 + \frac{59}{2} = 37\frac{13}{59}$.

Likewise dividing the same by $27\frac{1}{3}$, the number of days in one sidereal revolution of the moon, we have $1098 \div 27\frac{1}{3} = 40\ \frac{7}{41}$.

Here in the last two cases there are fractions of nearly $\frac{1}{4}$th and $\frac{1}{6}$th of a day respectively. Still the poets seem to have neglected them as insignificant or adjusted the fraction as often as it amounted to a day or two. Accordingly the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[14] counts only 35 instead of 36 intercalary days in a particular cycle of six years or two cycles of three years each.

It is therefore clear that the Vedic poets had a cycle of three *savana* years with 18 intercalary days added at the rate of nine days before and nine days after the central day called *viṣuvan*. The two halves of the year were called earth and heaven, each containing 27 periods of 7 days, as clearly stated in the passage quoted above. Now 27 periods of 7 days are equal to 3 periods of 63 days or steps each, as stated in the *Aitarega Brāhmaṇa*.

The division of the year into weeks of 7 days though not with the names of planets, seems to have been an accomplished fact.

The following verses of the *Atharva Veda*[15] furnish additional proof of the connection of the worlds and three years' cycle :—

"Of all the many god-frequented pathways that traverse the realm between the earth and heaven,

[14] X, 8, 10. [15] VI, 55

Consign me, all ye gods, to that which leadeth to perfect and inviolable safety.

Maintain us in well-being summer, winter, dew-time, and spring, autumn and rainy season.

Give us our share of cattle and of children. May we enjoy your unassailed protection.

Pay to the *year* your lofty adoration, to the *first* year, the *second*, and the *present*.

May we abide in the auspicious favour and gracious love of those who claim our worship".

Griffith and other translators of the *Vedas* have taken this to refer to a cycle of three lunar years. But as stated in clear terms in the *Nidāna Sūtra*, it is a cycle of three civil-solar years. What deserves particular attention in these verses is the beginning of the year with summer, the goal of the earth, and heaven in winter.

It is now clear that three earths and the three realms of night spoken of in I, 102, 8 ; 105, 5; 109, 9 ; VI, 44, 23 and the three-wheeled chariot in X, 85, 14 seem to refer to the same cycle of three years. I have already pointed out that the two worlds, called heaven and earth (*dyāvāpṛthivī*), or father and mother, are the two *ayanas*, the northern and southern, both making together a year. The cow, the mother, is also said as bringing forth a new calf every year, between worlds. In the same hymn (I, 164, 7), the poet speaks of three mothers and three fathers bringing forth a single child. This also seems to refer to the cycle of three years. The verse runs as follows :—

" Bearing three mothers and three fathers, single he stood erect : they never make him weary."

The three-wheeled chariot of the Aśvins to carry the sun's daughter for her marriage [16] seems also to allude to the cycle of three years, inasmuch as the 6th verse of the same

[16] I, 34, 5 ; X, 85, 14.

hymn speaks of three heavens, three earths and three water-worlds. Three lucid regions, the threefold *amṛta*, and the chariot with the sevenfold reins [17] the three earths and three heavens resting on Varuṇa [18] the thrice seven close-pressed ridges and the thrice-sixty Maruts spoken of [19] can all find a satisfactory explanation on the hypothesis of the cycle of three years. The numbers, 7, 21, and 63 are, as already pointed out, the week of 7 days, three weeks of 7 days and 9 weeks of 7 days. It is probable that since the numbers of days of every third year was divisible by 7, the division of the year into periods of 7 days each was for the first time applied only to the intercalary year before applying it to all years, whether ordinary or intercalary.

Whether the cycle served the purpose sought for it is another question. It is enough to know that it is a cycle of three years. The six days above the *savana* year or 360 days are termed *Atirātras* and are so stated in the *Sūryaprajñapti.* [20]

If there is still any doubt about the observance by the Vedic Poets of a cycle of three civil years of 360 days each with eighteen intercalary days, the following passage from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* [21] will remove it :—

" Now what seven hundred and twenty bricks there are (in the fire-altar), they are three hundred and sixty *Yajuṣmati* bricks ; and what thirty-six there are in addition, they are the thirteenth intercalary month."

Evidently the author of this passage identifies the 720 of the seven hundred and fifty-six bricks of the altar with the 360 days and 360 nights of the year [22] and the remaining thirty-six bricks, with the days intercalated to the year.

[17] VI, 44, 23-24.
[18] VII, 87, 5.
[19] VII, 85, 2 and 8.
[20] Pp. 218-220.
[21] X, 5, 4, 5.

[22] The altar being identical with the year, the 720 bricks represent the days and nights of the year. Eggeling, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (S.B.E.), Part IV, p. 383.

It is easy to understand that the author meant a cycle of six civil-solar years, when the civil or *savana* year of 360 days will fall short of six solar years of 366 days each by 36 days. Evidently this is the same thing as adding 18 days to every third civil year in order to adjust it with the solar year of 366 days.

Professors Macdonell and Keith are of opinion that though there are evident references to the *Devayāna* or *Uttarāyaṇa* and the *Pitṛyāna* or *Dakṣiṇāyana* in the *Vedas*, the limits of the *āyanas* are not known and that there are only doubtful references to the solstice in the *Ṛgveda*.[23] But it must be borne in mind that the *āyanas* would not be spoken of, unless their limits, the two solstices, were known. Nor does it seem to have been so difficult a task to understand the beginning and the close of the *āyanas*. One of the striking features of the *āyanas* is, as clearly stated in the passage of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* quoted above, the elongation and contraction of days and nights in the *uttarāyaṇa* and contraction and elongation of days and nights in the *dakṣiṇāyana*. Another important feature is that the shadow cast by a gnomon on the day of summer solstice is the shortest and that on the day of winter solstice is the longest in the northern latitudes. These two seem to be the striking features availed of by the Vedic poets to determine their solstices. The *Sūryaprajñapti* of the Jainas relies upon them as unfailing guides. According to the latter the day in midsummer measures 18 *muhūrtas* or 14 hours and 24 minutes with a shadow of 24 *aṅgulas* in length; and that of winter solstice 12 *muhūrta*; with a shadow of 48 *aṅgulas*. Evidently a day of 14 hours 24 minutes occurs only about the latitude of 36° degrees and not below and certainly not in Magadha (latitude 24°), the place where Mahāvīra the author of the *Sūryaprajñapati* lived.

[23] *Vedic Index*, Vol. II, p. 467.

It appears therefore that it was a traditional account relating to earlier times and higher latitudes where the Vedic poets, the ancestors of both the Jainas and the Brāhmaṇas, lived. We cannot expect the Vedic poets, especially those of the *Ṛgveda*, to tell us the length of the day or night in hours and minutes or in *muhūrtas* or *nāḍīs*. The division of days and nights in *muhūrtas* and *nāḍīs* does not seem to have been known to them. Even assuming that it was known to them, there was no instrument to precisely measure those divisions. The use of the shadow of a gnomon in measuring the *muhūrtas* is a complicated business beyond the capacity of the Vedic poets. It is not so simple a process as the determination of the solstices by observing the shortest and longest shadows of definite length cast by a gnomon of a fixed length. Nor even does the waterclock referred to both in the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya seem to have been known. The one contrivance which the poets seem to have made use of to ascertain day divisions was the recitation of Vedic hymns. As already pointed, the utterance of 216,000 syllables measured a day. That is $\frac{216,000}{60} = 3,600$ syllables measure a *nāḍikā* of 24 minutes. According to Varāhamihira's *Pañcasiddhāntikā*,[24] a *nāḍikā* is measured by the recitation of 60 verses of 60 syllables each, *i.e.*, 3,600 syllables. The syllables of one set of seven meters used in the *Vedas* amount to 252. They take nearly 2½ minutes to recite.

That the Vedic poets used the meters to determine the day or night time, is clearly stated in the following passage of the *Nidāna Sūtra*.[25]

" In the *Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice the twelve *stotras* or sets of verses chanted leave three *muhūrtas* or 6 *nāḍikās* unmeasured. From this it is clear that each set of a *stotra* measured a *muhūrta*. Accordingly it may be presumed that the

[24] *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, p. 82. [25] IX, 8.

Agniṣṭoma-day measured only 12 *muhūrtas*, since only 12 *stotras* are used to measure the time of that sacrifice: the *Ukthya*-day with fifteen *stotras* was a day of 15 *muhūrtas* and that *Soḍaśī* day was measured by a set of 16 *stotras*, corresponding to its 16 or more *muhūrtas*."

Anyhow, it is probable that twelve being the least, the shortest day or night of the Vedic poets measured only 12 *muhūrtas*; and this question requires elaborate investigation.

Another important feature of the solstice days seems to be the length of the shadow cast by a gnomon or *Puruṣa* as it is termed in the astronomical works of the Hindus. In almost all of the astronomical works and especially the *Sūryaprjñapti* of Mahāvīra it is stated that the lowest shadow cast by a *puruśa* or gnomon of 12 *aṅgulas* in height is 2 *pādas* or 24 *aṅgulas* and that during the six months from the summer solstice in *Śrāvaṇa* the shadow grows longer by 4 *angulas* each month, measuring 48 *aṅgulas* or 4 *pādas* on the day of the Winter solstice in the month of Māgha. We are not however told precisely whether they measured the midday shadow or the shadow at any other time. The commentator on the *Sūryaprajñapti* says that the shadow cast by a gnomon or any other thing either in the morning or in the evening was the shadow meant by the author of the *Sūryaprajñapti*. But according to the *Pañcasiddhāntikā* and other later astronomical works, it is the midday shadow that is always used in astronomical calculations. It is more than probable that the poet-astronomers of the Vedic age made use of the midday shadow in their astronomical considerations. The reason for this is not far to seek; in order to find out the east-west line and north-south line, the author of *Śrauta Sūtra* requires us to draw a circle with a diameter comprising as many *aṅgulīs* as the gnomon is high. The line joining the two points on the circumference of the circle where the gnomon's shadow enters into and passes out of the circle is taken as the

east-west line. Then taking these two points as centres, two arcs of circles with any diameter are described.

Through the intersecting points of these two arcs a line is drawn and it is taken to be the north-south line; and is called the 'fish' or *yava*, 'barley corn.'[26]

As will be seen, the Vedic poets seem to have called their gnomon *Vāmana* or dwarf and its shadow *Vāmana's* or Viṣṇu's foot-prints. It is therefore more than likely that they noticed the fish-figure when they attempted to find out the east-west line and the north-south line.[27] We shall also see how the day of winter solstice once occurred when the sun passed through the zodiacal sign Pisces which is marked by the constellations Pūrva-bhādrapāda, Uttara-bhādrapāda, and Revatī. Three quarters of the first of the above three stars mark also the sign of Aquarius. It is probable that the reason why the last or the 12th sign of the zodiac is called Pisces is the formation of the fish-figure noticed when attempt was made to find out the north-south line. Anyhow it appears certain that the intimate connection of the fish-figure with the gnomon's shadow, as shown above, points to the selection of the midday shadow. There is, however, no evidence to prove that the Vedic poets knew how to ascertain the meridian line and the horizontal line and surface, these being two important points essential to determine the position of the sun in the ecliptic circle. All that I venture to ascribe to their credit is that they attempted to find out approximately the arrival of equinoctial, and solstitial days by roughly measuring the strides made by Viṣṇu on those days. It does not require much knowledge of mathematical astronomy to know that the shadow cast by a gnomon on the day of summer solstice is least and that it is the longest on the day of winter solstice. Once this is known, it is by far the easiest process to ascertain

[26] Bodhāyana's *Śulva Sūtras*, Pandit, Vol. 9, and *Pañcasiddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira, p. 25.

[27] *Tait. Sam.* V, 2, 5.

by the measurement of the gnomon's shadow the arrival of the solstitial days, of course within the limits of an error of eight or nine days before or after. Another important point to be borne in mind in this connection is the early or periodical migration of the poets from upper to lower latitudes in the north. Hence it is that we read of 4, 5, or 6 strides of Viṣṇu instead of the usual 1, 2, or 3 strides.

"Through all this world strode Viṣṇu; thrice his foot he planted and the whole was gathered in his footstep's dust."

Ṛg. I, 22, 17.[28]

"A mortal man, when he beholds two steps of him who looks upon the light, is restless with amaze; but his third step doth no one venture to approach, no, nor the feathered birds who fly with wings."

Ṛg. I, 155, 5.

"The station indicated by the third step is invisible, because it is far away, south to the equator.

(Viṣṇu) who verily alone upholds the three folks, the earth, the heaven, and all living creatures."

Ṛg. I, 154, 4.

"A thousand heads has *Puruṣa*, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet. Having covered the earth on every side, he rose up by ten *aṅgulas*.

This *Puruṣa* is all that yet *hath been* and all that is *to be*.

His one *Páda* is all the creatures and his third *Páda* is nectar in heaven.

With three *Pádas* he went up; his (first) *Páda* has again been here. Thence he strode out to every side what eats not and what eats.

Ṛg. X, 90, 1-4.

[28] Also *Tait, Sam.* I, 2, 13.

"Step widely Viṣṇu; give us broad space for dwelling in.

Fire is to be kindled by the navel of Viṣṇu; ....

It is twelve *aṅgulas (prâdeśa)* only: for so much is the navel of Viṣṇu."

Kāṭhaka Sam. XX, 7.

The priest imitating Viṣṇu's strides says:—

"Thou art the step of Viṣṇu smiting enemies, with *gāyatrī* meter I step across the earth; thou art the step of Viṣṇu smiting imprecations, with *triṣṭubh* meter I step across the atmosphere; thou art the step of Viṣṇu, smiter of the evil doer, with the *jagati* meter I step across the sky; thou art the step of Viṣṇu, smiter of the enemy; with *anuṣṭubh* meter, I step across the quarters."

Tait. Sam. I, 6,5.

The wider the shadow is, the greater is the number of steps, and accordingly greater the certainty of the arrival of the day of winter solstice; hence the poet asks Viṣṇu to complete his usual three strides. The last passage makes the strides four instead of three. As the meters enumerated here contain 24, 44, 48 and 32 syllables respectively, it is probable that the syllables represented the *aṅgulas* of the steps and that the *anuṣṭubh* measured the shadow of some day after winter solstice. Accordingly we read

"In that he takes the steps of Viṣṇu, the sacrificer becoming Viṣṇu, wins these worlds by the meters so as to be irrecoverable."

Tait. Sam. I, 7, 6.

"The *Devas* and the *Asuras* strove for these worlds. Viṣṇu saw this dwarf; he offered it to its own deity. Then he conquered these worlds."

Tait. Sam. II, 1, 2.

"When he obtains a thousand cattle (cows) he should offer a dwarf to Viṣṇu."

Tait. Sam. II, 1, 4.

Here the *Devas* are the *uttarāyaṇa* and the *Asuras* the *dakṣiṇāyana*. The gnomon is the dwarf. A dwarf sacrificial beast is also meant by it.

"When with Indra, O Viṣṇu, thou didst strive, then didst thou in three divide the thousand . . .

Then said Indra, about to slay Vṛtra, "O friend Viṣṇu, step thou more widely."

Tait. Sam. III, 2, 11.

"In that he strides the steps of Viṣṇu by them he secures the yonder world."

Tait. Sam. V, 2, 1.

The number 1000 and its division into three parts will be explained later on. It should be noticed here that the slaying of Vṛtra by Indra coincided with the strides of Viṣṇu.[29]

The Vedic literature abounds in passages referring to the strides of Viṣṇu and for want of space only a few, selected here and there, are quoted here. In all these passages Viṣṇu or Puruṣa is always mentioned with his three strides or footprints. The word *puruṣa* is still a technical name given to the gnomon in all the astronomical works of the Hindus. Hence it is inferred that *puruṣa* is probably a gnomon bearing the name of Viṣṇu, the sun. The custom of making a line of shadow in the sacrificial hall, as stated in the following passage of the *Atharva Veda* (XIII, 1, 57), supports this inference. The passage runs as follows:—

"Thou, who, between the fire and me, passest across the line of shadows (*chāyā*), thy root, I sever: never more mayest thou cover the shadow on the ground."

The hymn in which this passage occurs is addressed to Rohita, certainly the sun. The following passages from the same hymn show that Rohita is the sun or Viṣṇu:—

"Rohita gave the earth and heaven their being; there the Parameṣṭhi held the cord extended.

[29] *Tait. Sam.* II, 4, 12 and II, 5, 2 where Vṛtra is said to have been slain at a full moon.

Thereupon reposeth Aja Ekapāda. He with his might hath established earth and heaven." (6)

"He measured out mid-air and all the regions." (7)

"He on earth the bright one's station hath reached heavenly light and all the worlds." (16)

"She hath come one-footed, or two-footed, four-footed, or eight-footed, or nine-footed. This Universe's thousand-syllabled *Paṅkti*." (42)

"This, O Immortal one, I know of these, thy progress to the sky, thy dwelling place in the loftiest heaven."

Here the Earth and Heaven are the *āyanas* and Aja Ekapāda is, as will be shown later on, the Pūrvabhādrapāda star. The cow referred to in verse 42 is the central day, as already pointed out. The number 1,000 will be explained later on. The immortal one is the sun identified with Viṣṇu or Puruṣa. The following verses from the *Tait. Saṃ.* (IV, 1, 8) is an additional proof of shadow measure:—

"He (Hiraṇyagarbha) supporteth the earth and sky . . .
He whose shadow is immortality and death." [30]

Here life and death mean *uttarāyaṇa* and *dakṣiṇāyana*; for as stated in the *Bhagavadgītā* (VIII, 24 and 25) the two *āyanas* are called by various names. Among them are (1) fire, (2) light, (3) day, (4) white for the *uttarāyaṇa* and (1) smoke, (2) night, (3) black are the names for the *dakṣiṇāyana*. Accordingly we can easily understand what the poet means when he says "I know this great *Puruṣa* who resembles the sun and who stands beyond the night (*i.e.*, *dakṣiṇāyana*); ... Whoever knows him will be immortal; for there is no other path for the *āyana*. [31]

The following passages from the *Taitt. Āraṇyaka* (I, 8, 28, etc., will establish beyond doubt that Viṣṇu's footsteps are the dividing marks of the *ayanas*:—

"O Viṣṇu, thou holdest firmly the two quarters (*rodasī*), and thou supportest the earth with the rays on both sides.

[30] Compare *Ṛg.* X, 121, and *A. V.* IV, 1, 8, [31] *Tait. Āraṇyaka* III, 12, 39.

That is the strength of Viṣṇu, they say. What splendour! What extreme limit! One alone! He holds those two bright quarters. They say that the strength of Viṣṇu is derived from the wind. With three feet he holds them. His one station is the best. This earth contains 1,000 and the sky also 1,000.[32] The Aśvins, the Bhujyus or the Nāsatyas as they are called, are the two lords of this whole world. The earth is the wife and the sky is the husband. They marry. Their sons are Rudra and the Lord of Speech; and Saramā is the daughter. Of these two, one is *white* (*uttarāyaṇa*) and the other is the bearer of sacrifice (*yajatam*). The days are dissimilar. Ye, two, are like the sky. ... The wonderful abodes of the world, the two store-houses, the sky and the earth, move like friends. Ye, both, with the Aśvins having their mules, hear my prayer and come to me with Sūryā the daughter of the sun."

If the three worlds, earth, air, and sky meant to the Vedic poets three divisions of the year from summer solstice to winter solstice in ascending order, and also the other three divisions of the other half in descending or reverse order, as clearly stated in the *Tait. Brāhmaṇa* quoted above, there is no reason to doubt that by the measure of these worlds in terms of *Puruṣa's* or Viṣṇu's *pādas* the poets must have necessarily meant the varying lengths of the *puruṣa's* (gnomon's) shadow in those three worlds. It is an astronomical fact that the shadow of a gnomon on a given day and in a particular place or latitude is a fixed quantity. I venture to believe that this fact was known to the Ṛgvedic poets and they ascertained the beginning and close of their two or three or six worlds by means of the *puruṣa's* shadow. The name of the gnomon in all Sanskrit astronomical works is *puruṣa*, a word which also means Viṣṇu. What else can we expect the poets to mean when they say in arithmetical numbers that *puruṣa* measured the earth with all its creatures with one

[32] *Tait. Āra.* I, 10, 1.

pāda (*pādo'sya viśvā bhutāṇi*) and that he rose more than three *pādas* high in the sphere of the sky (*tripādūrdhvam udait puruṣaḥ ... tripād asyámṛtam divi*)? At the very beginning of the *Puruṣasūkta* hymn (*Ṛg*., X, 85) the poet says that, the wonderful *puruṣa* covered the entire earth and stood up by *ten aṅgulas*. When so saying, they must be taken to be either childish, bordering on lunacy, or admirably learned and keen in observing astronomical facts and figures in the dark epoch in which they lived. I prefer to take the latter view, in as much as the measures of the shadow in *pādas*, as given in the *Puruṣasūkta* and other hymns admirably determines the two solstices for the latitude of 36° degrees, which formed one of their earliest homes on their way towards the interior of India. In order to work out these problems and verify the figures, it is necessary that we should know the exact height of the *puruṣa* and the length of the *pāda*. In our modern astronomical works *puruṣa* is invariably taken to be of 12 *aṅgulas* in height and *pāda* (or *pâda*, its synonym), is also taken to be of 12 *aṅgulas* in length. But in the *Śrautasūtras*, *puruṣa* means a pole of 120 *aṅgulas* and *pāda* a quarter of any measure,[33] or 30 *aṅgulas* in this case. Taking the latter measures, we may work out the sum and see whether the figures hold good for the latitude of 36° degrees or any other latitude. Now the statement of the *Puruṣasūkta* is that *puruṣa* measured the earth, *i.e.*, summer solstice with one *pāda* or 30 *aṅgulas* and the sky, *i.e.*, the winter solstice with three *pādas* or 90 *aṅgulas* more than his own height. That is how I explain the word *ūrdhva* in *tripād ūrdhvam udait puruṣaḥ*. Now the tangent of the angle subtending the are forming the zenith distance of the sun is $\frac{30}{120} = \frac{1}{4} = \cdot 25$ where 30 is the length of the shadow and 120 is the gnomon. Hence the angle is 14° degrees from trigonometrical tables. This added to 24° degrees, the measure of the sun's

[33] Bodhāyana's *Śulva* and Kapardi Swami's Commentary on *Āpastamba Śulva*, *paṭala* II and III. There seems to be a *puruṣa* of 96 *aṅgulas* in height also.

declination on the day of summer solstice, gives 38° degrees for the latitude.

Similarly for the winter solstice, tangent of the zenith distance is $\frac{(90+120)}{120}=\frac{21}{12}=\frac{7}{4}$. Hence from the *Sūryasiddhānta* tables the corresponding arc or angle is 60°. Deducting from this the measure of the sun's declination (as the sun is in the southern hemisphere), we have 60°−24°=36°.

It is also stated that *Puruṣa* measured the atmosphere or the rainy season (not the equinox, vernal or autumnal) by two *pādas* or 60 *aṅgulas*. The zenith distance of the sun corresponding to the shadow of 60 *aṅgulas* is about 27°, *i.e.*, when the sun is about 9° above the equator. This perhaps marks the time of *aparapakṣa*, the latter half of the month of Bhādrapada when the *pitṛs* are worshipped.

The difference of 2° in the latitude as measured by the length of the shadow on the summer solstice may be due to various causes. Difficulty in placing the gnomon exactly in the meridian circle, error in reading the length of the shadow, measuring the shadow before or after true midday, unevenness of the surface, etc., these and other causes introduce no small error in the shadow-measure. Notwithstanding these unavoidable errors, the continued observation of the measures of the shadow and those of the length of the day for 7 or 8 days before the solstitial day would not fail to apprise the poets of the arrival of the expected day. The other measures of Viṣṇu's strides frequently referred to in the Vedas, such as 10 *aṅgulas prādeśa* or 12 *aṅgulas*, three *pādas*, four *pādas*, etc., may probably relate to the determination of other auspicious occasions of the year. Anyhow the shortest shadow and the longest day of 18 *muhūrtas* appear to have been the determinants of the summer solstice, while the longest shadow and the shortest day of 12 *muhūrtas*, *i.e.*, the *Agniṣṭoma* day with twelve *stotras* corresponding to the 12 *muhūrtas*, indicated the arrival of the winter solstice. The reference made

in the *Nidānasūtra*[34] to a day and a night of 15 *muhūrtas* each and also to a day of 12 *muhūrtas* clearly implies a day of 18 *muhūrtas* and a night of 12 *muhūrtas*. These considerations incline me to believe that the Vedic poets divided the year into two halves termed the earth and heaven, also called mother and father and that the longest day and shortest shadow characterised the extreme limit of the *uttarāyana* and the shortest day and longest shadow the close of the *dakṣiṇāyana*.

Now this *Puruṣa* is also called by various names such as Viṣṇu, Tripāda, Aja Ekapāda, Nārāyaṇa or Naranārāyaṇa, Nara being the name of Arjuna or Phalguṇa. Now if Viṣṇu's feet measured the shadow and thereby determined the winter solstice at the middle of the year, we might take it for granted that head of the year lay on the midsummer day when the rains began from the month of Purusha, and the goddess Sūryā, the daughter of the Sun was married to the Moon. From the legend recorded in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, we learn that Viṣṇu's head once lay at the Maghā star and was cut off by the springing of the bow, which he held in his hand resting his head on one of the extremities of that bow bent with the string. Accordingly the feet must lie at the fourteenth star from the Maghā. The 14th star is Śatabhiṣak. Hence the feet must be on that star. But from the name, Aja Ekapada, given to the Pūrvabhādrapada, it appears that the feet lay at the beginning of the 15th asterism. This is not, however, a serious error, considering the age when this observation was made. Or we may take the beginning of Pūrvaphālgunī as the place of the head and the beginning of Pūrvabhādrapada as the place of the feet. Owing to the precession of the equinoxes the solstitial point receded from the beginning of the Pūrvaphālgunī through Maghā to the end of Āśleṣā, in the course of about 1200

[34] *Nidāna*, II, 13 and IX, 8.

years. Hence the summer solstice, the place of *Pṛthivī* (the beginning of *Dakṣiṇāyana*) took its place at the end of Āśleṣā instead of Maghā, carrying the head of Viṣṇu to that new place. This was a wonderful and rather astonishing phenomenon to the trained observers of the heavens, who were habituated to observe the head of Viṣṇu in the constellation of Maghā for about 1000 years under the unmistakeable test of the gnomon and the *stotras*. Hence the Vedic poets frequently say that Viṣṇu's head was cut off and blown away from the constellation of Maghā, its usual resting place.

As has been already pointed out, the Vedic poets adjusted their civil year of 360 days with their solar year of 366 days by interculating 18 days once in three years or 2×99 days once in 33 years. They added nine days before the central winter solstice day and nine days after it in every third year or 99 days before and 99 days after the central day in every 33rd year or 11th cycle of three years. These days they called the castles of the serpentlike Vṛtra who is described as having imprisoned the waters in his coils on account of the delay of the arrival of the rains to the extent of the number of intercalary days. Later on Vṛtra seems to have become the Śeṣa serpent lying on the line beginning and ending with the two solstices with its head in Uttaraphālgunī and its tail in the Uttarabhādrapada called Ahirbudhnya. The Vedic poets seem to have observed two kinds of years, one the sacrificial year beginning with winter solstice and another popular year beginning with the summer solstice. Hence they call the winter solstice the central day on some occasions and at other times the summer solstice also as the central day.

This important myth about the cutting of Viṣṇu's head is narrated in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIV. 1,116 etc.) as follows:

"But, indeed, Viṣṇu was unable to control that love of glory of his; and so even now every one can control that love

of glory of his. Taking his bow, together with three arrows he stepped forth. He stood, resting his head on the end of the bow. Not daring to attack him the gods sat themselves down all around him. Then the ants said—'What would you give to him who would gnaw the bowstring?'—'We would give him the constant enjoyment of food, and he would *find water* in the desert.' 'So be it,' they said. Having gone into him, they gnawed his bowstring. When it was cut, the ends of the bow, springing asunder, cut off Viṣṇu's head. It fell with the sound *ghṝn* ; and on falling it became yonder sun; and the rest of his body lay stretched out towards the east."

"And Makha, indeed, is the same as Viṣṇu. Hence Indra became Makhavat (possessed of Makha), since Makhavat is he who is mystically called Maghavat, for the gods love the mystic." (*Śat. Br.*, XIV. 1, 1, 13).

The text goes on, narrating how the gods succeeded in performing their headless sacrifice, and how they learnt the art of such performance from a sage called Dadhyanch who lost his head for revealing it and got a horse's head put on by the Aśvins and how the priests symbolically represented that performance by the Pravargya ceremony forming part of all Soma sacrifices. In the Pravargya rite, the priests prepare an earthern pot called Mahavīra to present the head of Viṣṇu or sacrifice and boiling milk in it, offer oblations into the fire. In this connection the following passages (*Śat. Br.*, XIV. 1, 2, 9) deserve notice:—

"O divine Heaven and earth, may I this day compass for you Makha's head. Makha being the sacrifice, he thus says, 'may I this day accomplish for you the head of the sacrifice.'—'On the earth's place of divine worship,'—for on a place of divine worship of the earth he prepares it,—'for Makha thee! for Makha's head thee!'—"

From this passage it is clear that Makha and Magha (star) were considered identical and that Magha (the star) was the head of the sacrifice on the earth's place,

i.e., on the beginning of the Dakṣiṇāyana and that after Viṣṇu's head had disappeared from that place and the head of the year receded back owing to the procession of the solstitial colure, as noticed both by observation of the stars and characteristic marks the longest day and the shortest shadow, the poet astronomers performed a *pravargya* rite through the period of intercalary days. This corroborates what Prof. Jacobi has said regarding the beginning of the Hindu year once in summer solstice in Maghā or Pūrva-phālgunī earlier still.[35] He quotes verses from the *Ṛgveda* (X.85, 13) and the *Atharvaveda* (XIV. 1, 13) in support of his view. Both the verses though varying in the reading of the word of Maghā, are of the same purport and as follows:—

"In Maghā the kine are killed, and in Phālgunī the marriage (of Surya) is held."

Considering this passage along with another Ṛgvedic passage (VII. 103, 9) implying the beginning of the year in midsummer the Professor concluded saying as follows:—

"Now the vernal equinox was in Kṛttikā and the summer solstice was in Maghā about 2500 B. C. The statement of the *Jyotiṣa* as to the position of the colures is much later and it corresponds to the fourteenth or fifteenth century B. C. and shows a repeated fixing of the colures. That, however, is less important for us now; the chief point is that the Vedic texts, properly so called, contain a determination of the colure which was evidently correct for them and was only corrected in the *Jyotiṣa*, a determination that leads us to at least the beginning of the three thousand years B. C. Considerably older than this, even, is the position of the colures, which we may infer for the Ṛgveda, a position, which, as our table shows, corresponded to reality about 4500 B. C."

[35] Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXIII, 1894, p. 154.

The tables appended to by him are as follows :—

ι	Draconis	3.0	magnitude	4.38	polar dist.	4700	B.C.
α	„	3.3	„	0. 6	„	2780	„
κ	„	3.3	„	4.44	„	1290	„
β	Ursae Minoris	2.0	„	6.28	„	1060	„
α	„	2.0	„	0.28	„	2100	A.D.

Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak also has come to the same conclusion in his *Orion* by finding references in the Vedas to the position of the equinoctial colure in the Mṛgaśiras.

Considering the loci of the head and feet of Viṣṇu and his foot-prints on the central and beginning days of the two worlds, the couple of Dyāvāpṛthivī, and the removal of Viṣṇu's head from the constellation Maghā, I have come to the same conclusion. This is not an accidental coincidence ; and it is hoped that the followers of the late Prof. Max Müller will change their cherished theories of 1500 B. C. fixed for the beginning of the Vedic literature and accept its beginning at the traditional commencement of the Kali-yuga in 3100 B. C. Though the rate of precession of the colure might not be known to the early Hindus, they knew at least its shifting once in every thousand years (in round numbers). For the first time its shifting from Maghā was, as seen above, noticed in the Brāhmaṇas. Next its location in the middle of Aśleṣā is found recorded in the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa. Later on in 550 B. C. situation of the summer solstice at the close of Puṣyā is recorded in the *Sūryaprajñapti* of the Jainas. In the latter part of the sixth century A.D. it is said to have been passing through the beginning of Punarvasu in the *Pañcasiddhāntikā* of Varāha-mihira. This shows a continued observation of the situation and shifting of the colures a number of times in the course of 3600 years.

III

The Vedic Gods and the Chronology of the Vedas.

Scholars may after all say that what I said regarding the chronology of the Vedas, basing it on the position of the solstitial colure in Maghā and its shifting from that position, is mere speculation deserving the same fate that attended the opinion of Prof. Jacobi and Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak. Under this apprehension, I propose to traverse along a different road and place before scholars what the Vedic poets have themselves to say regarding their own era. They seem to have counted 3339 years from some starting point and recorded it in Ṛg. III, 9, 9. They seem to have regarded each year a god; and the total uumber of gods seems to have amount to 3339. I propose to prove this and place it before Vedic scholars for impartial consideration and judgment.

I have pointed out in the second section of this paper that the two worlds, called the heaven and earth (*Dyāvāpṛthivī*) and also father and mother, are the two *āyanas*, the northern *āyana* and the southern *āyana*, both making together one year, and that the three fathers and three mothers indicate a cycle of three years. Closely associated with the cycle of three years are the gods and intercalary days under the name Vṛtra. This view is confirmed by the following passages from the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda* :—

"True to his holy law, he (Varuṇa) knows the twelve moons with their progeny: he knows the moon of later birth.

He knows the pathway of the wind......he knows the gods who dwell above."

Ṛg. I, 25, 8-9.

"Lord of red steeds (Agni), who lovest song, bring thou these three and thirty-three gods."

Ṛg. I, 55, 2.

Here in the first verse the year of 12 full moons is clearly mentioned and the moon of later birth is the new year. The pathway of the wind is 63 days in each of the six worlds, as already shown above. The gods are the deities of the years. The prayer to Agni to bring the 33 gods implies the recurrence of the cycle of 3 years or 11 cycles.

"O ye eleven gods whose home is heaven, O ye eleven who make the earth your dwelling,

Ye who with might, eleven, live in waters, accept this sacrifice, O gods, with pleasure.

Ṛg. I, 139, 11.

"The period I have measured—come to heaven.

I would my life were long.—

Not to be measured out again, a hundred autumns not before.

The Fathers of our father, his grandfathers, those who have entered into air's wide region,

Those who inhabit the earth, or dwell in heaven, these fathers will we worship with oblation.

A.V. XIII, 2, 45; 49.

The Ṛgvedic verse above evidently alludes to a cycle of 11 years and distributes its 33 gods by placing eleven on the earth, eleven on the atmosphere and the last eleven on the sky. The forty-ninth verse of the *Atharvaveda* (XIII, 2) calls the gods on earth fathers, those of the air grandfathers and those of the sky great-grandfathers. In the *śrāddha* or ancestral ceremony performed by every Brahmana once a year, the father is identified with Vasu and placed on the earth, the grandfather with Rudra in the air and the great-grandfather with the Āditya in the sky. This is evidently a corroboration of the observance of a cyclic rite performed once in three years calling upon the three fathers to come and accept the

offerings presented to them. In verse 45 of the same hymn the poet seems to allude to the long cycle already counted and wants to have a short cycle of 100 years, for the sake of the easy facilities it affords to measure. The *Ṛgveda* (X, 88, 15; 16; 18) also alludes to a long cycle of the two paths as follows:—

"I have heard mention of two several pathways, way of the Fathers and of gods and mortals.
On the two paths, each moving creature travels, each thing between the father and the mother.
These two united paths bear him who journeys born from the head and pondered with the spirit............
How many are the Fires and Suns in number?
What is the number of the Dawns and Waters?
Not jestingly I speak to you, O Fathers, Sages,
I ask you this for information."

Here the two pathways are the *dakṣiṇāyāna* and the *uttarāyāna* making one year, the seat of one father and mother and one god. The united paths are one, and the birth place of Agni is at its head, the beginning. The sun, namely Viṣnu or Puruṣa is in the middle. Accordingly the poet asks the assembled persons and sages to tell him the number of fires and suns, *i.e.*, the years counted so far. He is serious in his question and asks them to tell him their count. The following passage from the *Atharvaveda* (XX, 12, 3) clearly shows that Vṛtra, the lord of the intercalary days was slain in the middle of the two worlds, *i.e.*, the two halves of the 3rd year:—

"Indra, when he had slain the resistless Vṛtras, forced with his might the two world halves asunder."

The three ages of Agni (*Ṛg.* III, 17, 3), the three births of fire (IX, 1, 7), and the triple generation of gods (*A.V.* XIII, 3, 21) are all clear references to the three years' cycle. While in the *Nidāna Sūtra* the three years' cycle is described in

clear arithmetical terms, the Vedic verses speak of the cycle in terms of worlds, fathers—and mothers, Agni's ages; and of the intercalary days in terms of serpent-like Vṛtras and his forts. In order to understand this we have to know how the Vedic poets viewed the daily and yearly motions of the sun or the worlds along the diurnal and yearly circles. To them the daily motion of the worlds seems to have been similar to their yearly motion, *i.e.*, the diurnal circle, in as much as the sun is said to have been passing each day through the earth, air, heaven, air, and earth again. In the words of the *Taitt. Br.* (III, 9, 6, 29) "the colour of the earth is equal to that of iron, that of the atmosphere similar to silver, and that of the sky golden"; and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (VII, 4, 125) compares the circular motion of the worlds to that of a serpent in the following words :—

"The sacrificer stands by (the goldman representing the sun) and worships him with serpent-named formulæ. The serpents doubtless are these worlds, for they glide along with everything here whatsoever there is; and Agni is no other than the self of all the gods. They, the gods, having laid down on the altar that self of theirs, were afraid lest these worlds should glide away with that self of theirs. They saw those serpent-named formulæ and worshipped with them; by these worships they stopped these worlds for him (Agni)."

Now we know for certain from the *Sūryaprajñapti* that the last days of the solar year of 366 days are called *atirātras*;[36] and from *Nidāna Sūtra* (V, 12) quoted above we also know that the Vedic poets kept a cycle of three civil-solar years and added 18 intercalary days to every third civil year. Evidently these 18 days are no other than the 18 *atirātra* days constituting the difference between three civil and solar years. From *Nidāna Sūtra* (V, 12) it is also known that the Vedic poets distributed half of their cyclic intercalary days before

[36] *Sūrjaprajñapti* (Nirnaya Sagara Press Ed.), pp. 218-220.

the central day and half after it, *i.e.*, half on what is called earth-side of the worlds and half on the heaven-side of the worlds. Almost all *Śrauta* writers enjoin the performance of a thousand *atirātras* and *Taitt. Āraṇyaka* (I, 10) says that "the earth contains one thousand and the sky also contains one thousand." Likewise in continuation of the *atirātra satras*, the *Taitt. Saṃhitā* (VII, 1, 5) says as follows :—

"This (the earth) was in the beginning the waters, the ocean. In it Prajāpati, becoming the wind moved. He saw her (the earth) and becoming a boar he seized her. Becoming Viśvakarmā, he wiped her. She extended. She became the broad earth. Hence she is called Pṛthivī (broad earth). In her Prajāpati made effort. He produced the gods, Vasus, Rudras, and Ādityas. The gods said to Prajāpati, 'Let us have offspring ?' He said, 'As I have created you by penance, so seek ye offspring in penance.' He gave to them Agni as a support. After a year they produced one cow ....It produced for the *Vasus, Rudras* and the *Ādityas* each 333 and thus she became the thousandth. The gods said to Prajāpati, 'cause a sacrifice to be made to us with a thousand.' They own this world and gave the thousand. He caused a sacrifice to be made by the *Rudras*.........They won the atmosphere and gave the thousand. He caused sacrifice to be made by the Ādityas with the *atirātra.* They won yonder world and gave the thousand."

Nothing can be more unintelligible and enigmatic and childish than the legend narrated in this and the next two passages. Still, if read in the light of the three years' cycle, nothing can possibly be more interesting and astonishing than these passages. The one cow is nothing but the starting new year, and the number 333 is nothing but 333 years that have elapsed since the start. Now in 333 solar years, the civil year falls behind by 333 × 6=1998, *i.e.*, nearly 2000 days. Distributing 2000 in the 333rd year, we have 1000 days before and 1000 days after the central day, 1000 on the

earth-side and 1000 on the heaven-side. The sinking of the earth in water is nothing but the occupation of the earth's place, *i.e.*, spring, and summer, by the rainy season for want of adjustment of the years. The boar is nothing but the zodiacal symbol of the vernal months, derived perhaps from the form of the shadow cast by the gnomon in that season, just as the figure formed by the two arcs drawn to determine the north-south line is called fish.[37]

The division of thousand among the two gods Indra and Viṣṇu, related in the next passage (VII, 1, 6) is also of the same class. The same is, I believe, the explanation of the story of a red brown cow coming with 333.

Read in this light, the following passage (*Taitt. San.*, III, 2,11) will enable us to know who Vṛtra was :—

" I impell you,
O Indra and Viṣṇu to the end of this work
Rejoice in the sacrifice and bestow wealth,
Furthering us with safe ways.
Both are victorious, they are not defeated,
Neither of them at any time hath been defeated ;
When with Indra, O Viṣṇu, ye did strive,
Then did ye in three divide the thousand.
Three ages are thine, O All-knower,
Three births in the dawns, O Agni ;
With them knowing, do thou propitiate the gods,
And be for the sacrificer health and wealth.
Agni abideth in three abodes
Of three foundations, the sage ;
May he offer, and may he satisfy for us,
The three sets of eleven (gods) ;
Let the others all be rent assunder.
O Indra and Viṣṇu, ye overthrow
The nine and ninety strong forts of Sambara;

[37] See Varāhamihira's *Pañcasiddhantikā*.

Of Varṣin, the *asura*, a hundred and a thousand heroes
Do ye slay irresistibly.
Then did his mother seek to persuade him,
' O Sun, these gods are abandoning thee.'
Then said Indra about to slay Vṛtra,
' O Friend Viṣṇu step thou more widely'."

Here, as elsewhere, Indra is the god of the atmosphere, and therefore of summer solstice. While Viṣṇu is the god of heaven and of winter solstice. The division of 1000 into three, means a big cycle made of 333 minor cycles of 3 years each. The three abodes of Agni are the three equinoctial or summer solstitial days, *i.e.*, those of three ordinary years. The three sets of 33 years are 11 cycles of 3 years each, each cycle being termed a god. The ninety-nine forts are nothing but 99 intercalary days on one of the intercalated year, *i.e.*, 99 × 2=198 days corresponding to 11 cycles of 3 years each. Similarly 1100 heroes may mean years or cycles or intercalary days. The intercalary days are the offspring of the same original cow-mother that has produced the other kind of days of the year. The former are omitted and latter are retained. Hence the mother's apprehension that Varṣin's heroes would be abandoned. The stride of Viṣṇu is, as already explained, the shadow measure indicating the solstitial days when the serpentlike intercalary days of serpent Vṛtra are slain by Indra.

In *Taitt. Saṃ.* II, 1, we are told in words of decided meaning that " the days and nights are cattle " and that " from the head of Vṛtra came out cows." I trust that this explanation of Vṛtra, cows, Indra, and Viṣṇu holds good in all the Vedic passages. In *Taitt. Saṃ.* II, 4, 4, 14 the moon is said to ' extend the length of days ' and in II, 5, 2 the sacrificer is said to invite all the gods to slay Vṛtra at the full moon; Vṛtra is also represented as growing at the new moon and resting between the earth and sky, *i.e.*, the two solstices,

It is to be borne in mind that intercalary months or days are named after *mala* (sin), demons (*rākṣas, nirṛti*), and other evil-doers. Hence it follows that gods are invited and worshipped whenever intercalary days are got rid of. From what is said above in this section it is clear that the Vedic poets intercalated 18 days once in a cycle of three years or 198 days once in a cycle of 33 years, which is the same thing as 11 cycles of 3 years each. It is in this big cycle when more than six months formed the intercalated part, that 99 forts of Vṛtra both on earth-side and the heaven-side were destroyed by Indra backed by Viṣṇu, but for whose strides the central solstitial day would have proved difficult to be discerned. It is probable that the Vedic poets kept a regular record of the number of intercalary days inserted in the middle of cyclic year now and then ; otherwise how could it be possible for them to say that one 'cow produced 1000 cows' and that 'the earth contains 1000 and the sky also 1000 (days).' From *Taitt. Saṃ.* (VII, 1, 5) quoted above it is clear that there was one cow at first and that produced 333 for each of the three sets of gods, the *Vasus*, the *Rudras*, and the *Ādityas*, she herself becoming the thousandth cow, the central day of the year. I lay particular emphasis on this play of numbers and request Oriental scholars to take my interpretation of the number into their impartial consideration. I venture to state that these numbers are susceptible of no other kind of explanation than the one I have suggested. Evidently the occasion of this passage refers to the 333rd year of their cyclic era when the gods also numbered 333 sets of their gods, the *Vasus*, *Rudras* and *Ādityas*, each year being regarded as one set of *Vasus*, *Rudras* and *Ādityas*, corresponding to the sidereal, the lunar, and the solar parts of the year. Hence I presume it to be beyond doubt that each year being considered a god, the total number of gods counted by the Vedic poets in sets of 3 each must necessarily

signify the total number of years they counted in their cyclic era.

From Bhaṭṭabhāskara's commentary on the *Taitt. Brāhmaṇa* (III, 11,2) it appears that the Vedic poets counted their yearly gods in sets of, three each, evidently corresponding to their cycles of three years. The text of the *Brāhmaṇa* and the commentary in its English version run as follows:—

"Thou, O Agni, art Rudra, the *Asura* of the *mighty sky*. Thou art the host *of the Maruts*, thou art the lord *of food*. Thou farest with the ruddy winds, blessing the household; thou as Puṣan dost, protectest thy worshippers with thyself. Let gods merge themselves among gods; let the first (set) merge itself in the second; the second in the third; the third in the fourth; the fourth in the fifth; the fifth in the sixth; the sixth in the seventh; the seventh in the eighth; the eighth in the ninth; the ninth in the tenth; the tenth in the eleventh; the eleventh in the twelfth; the twelfth in the thirteenth; the thirteenth in the fourteenth; the fourteenth in the fifteenth; the fifteenth in the sixteenth; the sixteenth in the seventeenth; the seventeenth in the eighteenth; the eighteenth in the nineteenth; the nineteenth in the twentieth; the twentieth in the twenty-first; the twenty-first in the twenty-second; the twenty-second in the twenty-third; .... the twenty-ninth in the thirtieth; the thirtieth in the thirty-first; the thirty-first in the thirty-second; the thirty-second in the thirty-third. O three-times eleven gods, O three-times thirty three (99) gods, become one with the later, with those of similar paths, with those of equal prominence with you."

Commentary: "The way of counting the gods is as follows: One god multiplied by three times eleven becomes thirty-three gods. These multiplied by three become ninety-nine. This is what is stated as 'three-times eleven, three-times thirty-three' (in the text). Again ninety-nine multiplied by three-times eleven are what are stated as 'the later' in the

text. They amount to three thousand, two hundred and sixty-seven. Then the lords of the first minor group are thirty-three; and those of the later are also thirty-three; the lords of the first important group are three; and those of the later are also three; thus adding them all together, they amount to three thousand, three hundred and thirty-nine."

The whole passage means nothing but a description of the addition of all the gods counted in sets of thirty-three and ninety-nine:—

(i)	First— $1 \times 3 \times 11$	=	33	
(ii)	3×33	=	99	
(iii)	$99 \times 3 \times 11$	=	3267	(*a*)
(iv)	The lords of the 1st minor cycle	=	3	
(v)	Those of the later minor cycle	=	3	
(vi)	„ „ first major group	=	33	
(vii)	„ „ later „ „	=	33	
	Total	=	72	... (*b*)

Grand Total $(a+b) = 3267 + 72 = 3339$

All that is meant in this calculation seems to be this :—

First one cycle of 3 years or gods	3
Then 11 cycles of 3 years each	33
Then 99 cycles of 33 years each	3267
Then one cycle of 33 years	33
Then one cycle of 3 years	3
Total ...	3339 years

For the reasons specified above, I venture to regard these gods as the gods of years counted by the Vedic poets in sets

of cycles of 3 years each. These gods are found mentioned in Ṛgveda III, 9,9 as follows:

triṇi śata trī sahasrāṇyagnim triṃśacca devā nava cāsaparyan,
aukṣan ghṛtaitrastṛṇan barhirasmā ādiddhotāram nyasādayanta.

"Three times hundred gods and thrice a thousand, and three times ten and nine have worshipped Agni; for him spread sacred grass with oil bedewed him and established him as priest and sacrificer."

The thirty three gods are found frequently mentioned not only in the *Ṛgveda*, but also in the *Yajus* and the *Atharva Vedas* (*Ṛg.* I, 139, 11; III, 6, 9; VIII, 28, 1; 30, 2; 35, 3, and in the *Zend-Avesta*, *Yasna* I, 10). The number of 3339 gods is also found in the *nivid* hymn for the Viśvedevas. In his translation of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (Vol. II, p. 212) Prof. Haug remarks on this number of Vedic gods as follows:—

"It is, however, highly interesting, as perhaps one of the most ancient accounts we have of the number of Hindu deities. They are here stated at three times 11: then at 33, then at 303, then 3003. It appears from this statement that only the number three remained unchanged, whilst the number 30 was multiplied by 10 and 100. Similarly the number of gods is stated at 3339 in a hymn ascribed to the Ṛṣi Viśvāmitra, Ṛgveda III, 9, 9. This statement appears to rely on the *Vaiśvadeva nivid.* For if we add together 33 and 303 and 3003, we obtain exactly the number 3339. This coincidence can hardly be fortuitous, and we have strong reasons to believe, that Viśvāmitra perfectly knew this *viśvedevāh nivid.* That it contains one of the most authoritative passages for fixing the number of Hindu deities follows from quotations in other Vedic books. So we read in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*[38] a discussion by Yājñavalkya on the

[38] Ed. by Roer, Calcutta, 1849, pp. 642-49.

number of gods, where he appeals to the *nivid* of the *vaiśvadeva* hymn as the most authoritative passage for settling this question. Perhaps the oldest authority we have for fixing the number of the Hindu deities, on the first instance, at thirty-three, is *Ṛgveda*, VIII, 28, 1. The hymn to which this verse belongs is said to have descended from Manu, the progenitor of the human race. Its style shows traces of antiquity, and there can be hardly any doubt, that it is one of the earliest vedic hymns we have. The division of these thirty three deities into three sets, each of eleven, equally distributed among the three worlds heaven, air, and earth, (see I. 139, II) appears to be the result of later speculations. According to the *nivid* in question, the gods are not distributed among the three worlds, but they are in heaven, and earth, water, and sky, in the *Brahma* and *Kṣatra*, in the *Barhiṣ*, and on the *Vedī*, in the sacrifice and in the air."

From this it is evident that the number 3339 in the oldest and was perhaps the number counted up to the time when the Vedic Āryas migrated towards India or settled on the banks of the Indus, Śatadru and the Ganges. This counting of years in terms of gods seems to have ceased —when the Kali-era of 5000 years, now intimately associated with the cycle of 5 years, began in B.C. 3101, as I have shown in my "Gavām āyana," the Vedic era. Hence the age of the Vedas seems to go so far back as 3101+3339=6440 B.C. This is, indeed, a fabulous figure for those who are accustomed to carry the Vedic period so late as B.C. 1500. Hence the only conclusion they would come to would be that my interpretation of the Vedic gods in terms of years is my own imagination! But if my interpretation be correct and true as I presume it to be, it would exactly tally with the date derived from Viṣṇu's head summer solstice at the end of Magha, or the Pūrvaphālguna and his feet or winter solstice in the beginning of Pūrvabhādrapada or the end of Śatabhiṣak. Even to-day the winter solstice is called the Viṣṇupada-puṇyakāla

or the auspicious time of Viṣṇu's stride and though the solstitial point has received by more than two signs now; the star of Pūrvabhādrapada is still marked in the calendar of the stars with Viṣṇu's three feet.

Also the Zodiacal sign corresponding, to the stars Maghā, Pūrvaphālgunī and a quarter of Uttarphālgunī is called Virgo or *Kanyā* and that which corresponds to the stars, the last quarters of Pūrvabhādrapada and the whole of the Uttarabhādrapada and Revatī if called Pisces or *Matsya.* Now according to the story of the marriage of Draupadī by the son of Pāṇḍu, narrated in the Mahābhārata, Arjuna or Phālguna is said to have shot the target of fish, aiming at it by seeing its reflection in water and have thus won the stake, the hand of the Virgin Draupadī, in marriage. This implied that Pisces was diametrically opposite to Virgo, the sign of summer solstice at that time.

In this attempt to win Sītā's hand in marriage, Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, is said to have broken the bow itself, implying thereby that Virgo as a sign of summer solstice was not opposite to the sign of Pisces at the time. This breaking of the bow by Rāma is the same thing as the springing of Viṣṇu's bow resulting in cutting off the head of Viṣṇu.

RASA-CULT IN THE CHAITANYA CHARITĀMṚTA.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

DR. ABHAYKUMAR GUHA, M.A., PH.D., B.L.,
Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Calcutta.

The current languages of Hindusthan are full of promise. In the course of a few centuries they have produced some master-pieces of which we may well be proud. The *Chaitanya-Charitāmṛta* by Kavirāja Kṛṣṇadāsa is one of them. It contains an account of the life and teachings of Śrī Chaitanya [1] of Bengal, one of the great teachers of the world. It occupies a very high place in the religious literature of the world. It has been of spiritual help to many a devotee and will ever be a light unto all seekers of religion.

Rasa-cult which really constitutes the backbone of Vaiṣṇavism takes up a considerable portion of this voluminous work. I purpose to give an exposition of this doctrine here. This short outline may be of some use as an introduction to the rasa-cult of Chaitanya.

Any one going through the religious literatures of the world will find that the seekers have approached God, generally speaking, from the standpoint of personal gain or from a sense of personal craving or from the standpoint of love for love's sake. When men approach God for riches, or power, or for deliverance from sins or earthly existence, they have in reality some object in view and this form of worship may be called *sakāma* or "interested" form of worship. But men may as well approach God as Love and Beauty for love's sake without any ulterior object in view. This form of worship

[1] I add "*Śrī*" to the name *Chaitanya* out of respect for that great teacher.

may be called *niṣkāma* or "disinterested" form of worship. When a devotee sees God who is All-Love and All-Beauty, he loses himself and goes on for ever beholding His Beauty. In the language of the *New Testament* he who finds Divine treasure, "he hideth it" and "for joy thereof goeth and selleth all he hath, and buyeth therewith that treasure which is simply invaluable to him." God Kṛṣṇa of the Vaiṣṇavas is the highest embodiment of Beauty and Love. He is so very sweet and so very beautiful that a single drop of His Beauty can drown all beings, small or great, in a flood of ecstatic joy.

सर्व्व प्राण करे आकर्ष ॥

श्रीचै., म., प. २१.[2]

In the words of Bilva-mangala—a wellknown *bhakta* of India, "His body is sweet, His face is sweet, His smile is fragrant and sweet. All is sweet, sweet, sweet."

मधुरं मधुरं वपुरस्य विभो
मधुरं मधुरं वदनं मधुरम् ।
मधुगन्धि मृदुस्मितमेतदहो
मधुरं मधुरं मधुरं मधुरम् ॥

श्रीकृष्णकर्णामृतम्.

The Vaiṣṇavas seek neither money nor power nor knowledge. Nor do they long for any other form of earthly gain. God's Love for love's sake is the only object of their attainment. Śrī Chaitanya in a well-known prayer has very beautifully expressed the same idea—

न धनं न जनं न सुन्दरीं कवितां वा जगदीश कामये ।
मम जन्मनि जन्मनीश्वरे भवताद्भक्तिरहैतुकी त्वयि ॥

श्रीचै., आ., प. २०.

[2] The following abbreviation have been used:
श्रीचै.—श्रीचैतन्यचरितामृत ; आ.—आदिलीला ; म.—मध्यलीला ; अ.—अन्त्यलीला ; प. परिच्छेद ।

To worship the Beauty of God for beauty's sake is the soul of the worship of the Vaiṣṇavas. All other dogmas and creeds are of subordinate importance. *Bhakti* or whole-hearted loving devotion towards God enables the devotee to love God with all His heart, with all his soul, and with all his strength. This whole-hearted love for the Name of God for love's sake is the only object of desire of the Vaiṣṇavas. Love for the Name of God is the same thing as love for God Himself, for the name of a thing expresses the thing itself. One who loves God must needs love all His creatures as himself for in all creatures he sees but the manifestation of his Beloved God. He further loves all other lovers of God who are the temple of God and in whom the spirit of God dwelleth. Chaitanya regards the above tenets as essentials of Vaiṣṇavism.

जीवे दया नामे रुचि वैष्णव सेवन ।
इहा बइ धर्म्म नाइ शुन सनातन ॥
श्रीचै., म.

But there are stages in the worshsp of God as Love for love's sake. The doctrine of the *rasas* as treated in the *Chaitanya Charitāmṛta* indicates the different stages of this loving devotion.

The word *rasa* etymologically signifies something which can be tasted or enjoyed. The Vaiṣṇavas speak of different kinds of *rasas* but as joyous experience is the main characteristic of all these *rasas*, they are in fact one. They appear many owing to *upādhis* or limiting adjuncts.

रसस्यानन्दधर्म्मत्वादैकर्थ्यं भाव एव हि ।
उपाधिभेदान्नानात्वं । अलङ्कारकौस्तुभ, किरण्.

The doctrine of the *rasas* implies that there is a subject capable of enjoying the *rasas* and there is an object expressing and arousing the *rasas*. In the technical language of the

Vaiṣṇavas the subject of the *rasa* is called the *āśraya* and the object of the *rasas* is called the *viṣaya.* The *bhakta* or the loving devotee who enjoys the *rasas* is the *āśraya* and God who is the source of the *rasas* is the *viṣaya.* In plain words the *rasa* when viewed from the Divine standpoint is that rapturous ecstacy which a devotee enjoys when he comes in contact with his loving God.

The devotees in the course of their whole-hearted love towards God attain different kinds of loving relations with God. The Vaiṣṇavas have discussed all these relations in their minutest details and have further shown how they can be practically enjoyed.

Rasa-cult as noted above presupposes the existence of an all-pervading principle of sweetness and bliss which renders all objects, animate or inanimate, sweet and blissful. The Āryas of India recognised such a principle from the earliest times. The texts which are cited at the time of the *śrāddha* ceremony in India while presenting honey to the deceased are texts of the *Ṛgveda* (I. 90. 6—9). They clearly bear testimony to an all-pervading source of bliss and joy.

मधुवाता ऋतायते मधु क्षरंति सिन्धवः । माध्वीर्नः सन्त्वोषधीः ॥
मधुनक्तमुतोषसो मधुमत् पार्थिवं रजः । मधु द्यौरस्तु नः पिता ॥
मधुमान्नो वनस्पतिर्मधुमाँ अस्तु सूर्यः । माध्वीर्गावो भवन्तु नः ॥

शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः शं नो भवत्वर्यमा ।
शं न इंद्रो बृहस्पतिः शं नो विष्णुरुरुक्रमः ॥

"Sweet be the air, let the seas drop sweetness; let the herbs be sweet. Night, dawn, and countries at large be sweet, and may our protector the sky be sweet. Sweet be the trees and the sun, and cow. May Mitra, Varuna, Aryama, Indra, Bṛhaspati, and all-powerful Viṣṇu be a source of joy to us."

Subsequently the *Ṛṣis* identify this principle with the Highest God Viṣṇu and tell us further that those who

hold unceasing communion with God Viṣṇu can alone realise Him.

उरुक्रमस्य स हि बन्धुरित्था विष्णोः पदे परमे मध्व उत्सः ॥

(*RV.* I. 154. 5.)

"The all-powerful highest Viṣṇu is the fountain of all sweetness. He is really our friend."

तद्विप्रासो विपन्यवो जागृवांसः समिन्धते । विष्णोर्यत्परमं पदम् ॥

(*RV.* I. 22. 21.)

"Those who are really earnest, prayerful, and ever-awake obtain the highest Viṣṇu."

Similar conceptions occur in the *Atharvaveda* as well.

शं नो द्यावापृथिवी पूर्व्वहूतौ शमन्तरिक्षं दृशये नो अस्तु ।
शं न ओषधीर्वनिनो भवन्तु शं नो रजसस्पतिरस्तु जिष्णुः ॥

(*AV.* XIX. 10. 5.)

"Joyous for us be the heaven and earth in our early invocations ; joyous for us be the atmosphere. Joyous be the herbs, the trees, and the conquering lord of the welkin (*rajas*).

The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* which is generally regarded as the earliest source of the doctrine of the *rasas* begins with "शं नो मित्रः" *etc.* of the *Ṛgveda.* The second chapter of this *Upaniṣad* called *Ānandavallī* contains a text which is the soul of the *rasa*-cult of the *Vaiṣṇavas.* It teaches that God is bliss and that all objects, animate or inanimate, become joyous by partaking of His bliss:

रसो वै सः । रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दी भवति ॥

The *Brahma-sūtras* refer to the same topic. The *sūtras* 12 to 17 of *Adhāya* I, *Pada* 1, give but a short sketch

of the *rasa*-doctrine of the Vaiṣṇavas. In the first place it is taught therein that God is *ānandamaya* or full of bliss, for He has repeatedly been called so in the Upaniṣads.[3] It may be objected that the suffix, *maya* signifies modification and so He is not full of *ānanda* or bliss but He is merely a transformation of bliss. Bādarāyaṇa points out that the suffix *maya* indicates fulness and not modification as contended. He is really *ānandamaya* or *full* of bliss.[4] Further it is taught in the scriptures that He is the source of the bliss of all objects, material or immaterial.[5] One who can afford bliss to others must Himself be full of bliss. So He is *ānandamaya*. In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* the Highest Brahman who has been characterised as "Truth, Light, and Infinite," has been called *ānandamaya* as well. Hence the Highest Brahman is really *ānandamaya*.[6] The attributes which are characteristic of the Highest Brahman have also been assigned to the *ānandamaya* and not the *jīva* as contended by the opposite party.[7] Further the *Smṛti* text **रसं ह्येवायं लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दी भवति**, makes a distinction between the person enjoying bliss and the Person who is the Source of Bliss. The *jīva* enjoying bliss cannot be its source as well. Hence the *jīva* cannot be *ānandamaya*.[8] The *Brahma-sūtras* also set down *bhakti* or whole-hearted love towards God as the means to the attainment of God.[9] The *Gītā* also proclaims the superiority of loving devotion but nowhere details its different stages. The *Bhāgavata* which is pre-eminently a work on Divine Love is the foundation of the teachings on Love as taught by the *Gauḍīya* school of Bengal. Śrīkṛṣṇa of the *Gopīs* is one made up wholly of beauty and

[3] आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् । I. 1. 12.

[4] विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात् । I. 1. 12.

[5] तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च । I. 1. 14.

[6] मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते । I. 1. 15.

[7] नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः । I. 1. 16.

[8] भेदव्यपदेशाच्च । I. 1. 17.

[9] अपि संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् । III. 2. 24.

sweetness, a Person in whom all the sweetness and beauty of the Universe had been put together. The Gopīs of Vṛndāvana had natural love and attraction for Him. They knew of none but Kṛṣṇa, they loved none but Kṛṣṇa. He was all in all to them. A moment's separation from Him caused them unbearable pain and appeared as if lasting many centuries. He was their Lord, He was their dear Friend, He was their affectionate Child, and above all He was their Sweetheart. These loving relations of the Gopīs have particularly been related in the tenth *Skandha* of the *Bhāgavata*. Chaitanya not only proclaims all these loving relations which devotees can have towards their loving God but shows how all these loving relations can practically be attained in one's life. He was, indeed himself, a living example of the *rasa-cult*.

The doctrine of the *rasas* has been treated by the Hindu rhetoricians and also by the Vaiṣṇava writers each in their own way. The former have treated it from the *human* standpoint and the latter from the *divine*. There are some technical terms which are common to both these classes of writers which require to be cleared up. According to the rhetoricians *Vibhāva* or the cause of arousing *rasas* is twofold, *ālambana* and *uddipanī*. That which serves as a cause for arousing a certain *rasa* or emotion in one's mind is called the *ālambana vibhāva* of the *rasa*. For instance, when a person sees his own son, affection arises in him, and so his son is an *ālambana vibhāva* of affection. Actions and thoughts which help to arouse a certain *rasa* or emotion are called *uddīpana vibhāvas* of that *rasa*. Thought of intelligence and heroism of one's son helps to arouse affection, and hence the son's intelligence and heroism are *uddīpana vibhāvas* of that *rasa*. European psychologists speak of the association of ideas; *uddīpana vibhāvas* are nothing but associated ideas and actions which help to arouse the *rasa* or emotion under certain laws. Outward expressions from

which the existence of a *rasa* may be inferred are called the *anubhāva* of that *rasa*. Among the outward expressions eight have been singled out by the rhetoricians as proceeding from the *sattva-guṇa*. They are *sthambha* (stiffness), *sveda* (perspiration), *romāñca* (erection of hair on end), *svarabhanga* (hoarseness), *vepathu* (trembling), *vaivarṇya* (discoloration), *aśru* (tears), and *pralaya* (trance).

Along with these real outward expressions there are other mental and bodily activities which arise occasionally in a subject having *rasa* or emotion. They are called *sañcāra* or *vyābhichārī* (accidental) expressions. They are thirty-three in number, *nirveda* (self-reproach), *dainya* (realisation of one's helplessness), *āvega* (shock), etc., may be taken as examples of these.

Now, to the number of the *rasas*. According to Amarasiṇha, the earliest known lexicographer of classical Sanskrit, there are eight *rasas* in all. They are—*śṛṅgāra* (amorous), *hāsya* (ludicrous), *karuṇa* (pathetic), *raudra* (furious) *vīra* (heroic), *bhayānaka* (terrible), *adbhuta* (sublime) and *bībhatsa* (detestable). Kavirāja Viśvanātha, the author of the *Sāhitya-Darpaṇa*, adds two more to the number, e.g., *śānta* (placid) and *vātsalya* (affectionate). Another rhetorician, Bhojarāja, adds one more, e.g., *preman* (love). Thus according to Bhojarāja there are eleven *rasas* in all. The Hindu rhetoricians are of opinion that these *rasas* are but different transformations of one undivided self-illuminating principle of bliss or joy. As milk is transformed into curd in conjunction with other materials, so the ordinary *ratis* or emotions are transformed into *rasas* or permanent emotions in conjunction with *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, and *sañcāra*.[10]

We have noted above that the Vaiṣṇava teachers have treated the doctrine of the *rasas* from the Divine standpoint.

[10] विभावेनानुभावेन व्यक्तः सञ्चारिणा तथा ।
रसतामेति रत्यादिः स्थायी भावः सचेतसाम् ॥

They allude to twelve *rasas* in all, of which five are principal and permanent and seven are secondary and accidental. The five principal *rasas* are *śānta*, *dāsya*, *sakhya*, *vātsalya*, and *madhura*.

शान्त दास्य वात्सल्य मधुर रस नाम ।
कृष्ण भक्तिरस मध्ये ए पञ्च प्रधान ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

I take up the five principal *rasas* first. When the devotees see the loving face of God their souls are enraptured and they form different loving relations with the God of their Love. Some of the devotees in the course of their divine communion simply enjoy a state of peace and pure joy without realising their relation to God whom they revere. They realise they are weak and helpless and God whom they worship is infinitely superior to them in intelligence and powers. Whole-hearted reverence for God constitutes the essence of this form of worship.

शान्तिरसे स्वरूपबुद्ध्ये कृष्णैकनिष्ठता ।
शमो मन्निष्ठता बुद्धिरिति श्रीमुखगाथा ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

Dr. D. C. Sen in his admirable work *Chaitanya and His Companions* rightly says of the *śānta-rasa*:

"*Sānta* means quiet. This is a state for which our Ṛṣis strove, and which we find pre-eminently in the Buddha. Look at any stone image of the Buddha, and what this quiet means will be realised at the sight of it."[11]

[11] P. 170. Be it noted that Dr. D. C. Sen in his other meritorious work—*Vaiṣṇava Literature of Medieval Bengal*—by way of explaining the characteristic of the *śānta rasa* cites the text—शान्ते श्रीकृष्णे निष्ठुरबुद्धिता. I take this to be a misprint. The correct reading should be stand as follows:

शान्ते श्रीकृष्णे निष्ठताबुद्धिः ॥

St. Paul refers but to this *śānta* state of the Yogin when he teaches that "the peace of God passeth all understanding," and the *Gītā* has in the following lines drawn attention to.

प्रशान्तमनसं ह्येनं योगिनं सुखमुत्तमम्।
उपैति शान्तरजसं ब्रह्मभूतमकल्मषम्॥ म. २७.

In the second form of loving devotion which goes by the name of *dāsya bhakti* the devotee fully realises his relation to God whom he loves and reveres. He fully realises God as His Lord and himself as His servant and leaves nothing undone to please his Master by loving service. The loving devotion of Mahāvīra towards Rāma, his God, is a standing illustration of *dāsya bhakti.* Kabīr is another instance. Kabīr totally lost his personality in his Master and his mind never travelled elsewhere.[12] The Love of Jesus is his Master, his Father and his love towards God may rightly be called *dāsya bhakti.*

ईश्वरज्ञान सम्भ्रम गौरव प्रचुर।
सेवा करि कृष्णे सुख देन निरन्तर॥
शान्तेर गुण दास्ये आछे अधिक सेवन।
अतएव दास्य रसेर एइ दुइ गुण॥
श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

But when the stage of *sakhya rasa* or loving friendship is reached, the sentiment of God's superiority disappears from the soul of the devotee so to speak and his loving devotion stands on a footing of equality. In this state God is pre-eminently the devotee's Friend and Associate. The devotee plays with Him, sports with Him, and even climbs on to His shoulders. He gives to His Friend all he has and freely opens

[12] तूं तूं करता तूं भया तुझमें रहा समाय।
तुझमाही मन मिलि रहा अबहूं अनत न जाय॥

his heart to Him. He pleases God not by reverence and loving service alone but particularly by his constant and devoted friendship. God to Muhammad was his Friend and Associate. Hafiz of Persia viewed his God as his loving Friend. Love for Him was his destiny and the dust of His door was paradise. But nowhere does this form of loving devotion come out in fuller light than in the cases of Sudāmā and Sarala of Vṛndāvana. These cowherds were the intimates of Kṛṣṇa and the only aim of their lives was to please Kṛṣṇa by their devoted friendship. They had no idea of His powers but took Him for one of their own. Their love was centered in Him and in Him alone. They played with Him, quarrelled with Him, took Him on their shoulders and even at times mounted on His. If He ever went out of their sight, they experienced unspeakable pain; without Him they threw themselves on the ground and grew too sad and forlorn to tend their herds and to do their simple pastoral work.[13] When they slept they dreamt of their loving Friend and uttered His name. Kṛṣṇadāsa notes the following characteristics of *sakhya love*:

शान्तेर गुण दास्येर सेवन सख्ये दुइ हय ।
दास्येर सम्भ्रम गौरव सेवा सख्ये विश्वासमय ॥
कान्धे चड़े कान्धे चड़ाय करे क्रीड़ा रण ।
कृष्ण सेवे कृष्ण कराय आपान सेवन ॥

श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

Next in order comes the *vātsulya rasa.* When the devotee views his God as pre-eminently one of affection and looks after His joy and welfare like a mother, the devotee may be said to have attained the stage of the *vātsalya* love. In this state the devotee loses all conception of God's powers, looks upon God as his own dear child and serves Him as best he can. He caresses and protects Him, and even at times

[13] Dr. D. C. Sen's *Vaiṣṇava Literature of Medieval Bengal*, pp. 188-90.

scolds and beats Him, just as one does to one's own child. Here God is his darling and he himself is His main prop. Kṛṣṇadāsa says of *vātsalya* :

वात्सल्ये शान्तेर गुण दास्येर सेवन ।
सेइ सेइ सेवनेर इँहा नाम पालन ॥
सख्येर गुण असङ्कोच अगौरव सार ।
ममताधिक्ये ताड़न भर्त्सन व्यवहार ॥
आपनाके पालनज्ञान कृष्णे पाल्यज्ञान ।
चारि रसेर गुण वात्सल्ये अमृत समान ॥

श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

The affection of Yasodā towards the Child Kṛṣṇa is a typical example of this *rasa*. Dean Inge in his *Christian Mysticism*[14] says that the German mystic Suso kissed the Baby Christ and " uttered a cry of amazement that He who bears up the heaven is so great and yet so small, so beautiful in Heaven and so childlike in earth." Suso's vision makes but the first stage of this form of Divine Love.

The crowning stage of Divine Love is attained when the devotee enters the stage of the *madhura* or sweet love, when he enters so to speak the stage of " spiritual marriage " in love. In this stage the sole aim of the devotee is to have the closest embrace of His Beloved. He lives in and for his Beloved and gives all he has to his Beloved. His Love enwrapts him, maddens him. He drinks deep in His Beauty, but his thirst quenches not. He stands " eye to eye crossed," and presses Him to his bosom ; but his craving diminishes not ; it is ever fresh and vigorous. Śrī Chaitanya has this stage of spiritual union in view when he says that a moment's separation from Govinda seems to him one of ages, tears flow in torrents down his cheeks, and the whole

[14] P. 176. See also Dr. D. C. Sen's *Vaiṣṇava Literature of Medieval Bengal*, Introduction, p. xvi.

universe appears as a mere void.[16] The Gopīs of Vṛndāvana are the best examples of sweet love. The Gopīs are "spiritual bodies" of love and beauty. They have nothing material in them, nothing carnal in them. Bāla Kṛṣṇa is the sole object of their love and attachment. They know of none but Kṛṣṇa. They seek neither money, nor powers, nor even their husbands and children. They are prepared to sacrifice themselves at Kṛṣṇa's feet. To afford joy to their loving Kṛṣṇa at the expense of their own is the sole aim of their loving worship. No matter if they are female in shape. Devotees male or female are equally welcome to the Shrine of Love, are equally privileged to offer their love to the God-Man of Beauty and Grace. It is rather the special privilege of women, for feminine qualities are more valued in the kingdom of love. To use the words of Newman, "if thy soul is to go on into higher spiritual blessedness, it must become a woman." In this form of love, all the characteristics of the preceding forms of love are present. The whole-hearted devotion of a *śānta yogin*, the devotion of a faithful servant, the sincere and unaffected love of a friend and associate, and the tender affectionate attachment of parents are indeed found combined in this form of love. But the fundamental characteristic, which marks it off from other forms of love described above, is its privilege to view God as his Sweetheart and Spouse and to serve Him and Him alone by his body and soul.

Kṛṣṇadāsa notices the following characteristics of this *madhura* form of love :

मधुर रसे कृष्णनिष्ठा सेवा अतिशय ।
सख्ये असङ्कोच लालन ममताधिक हय ॥
कान्तभावे निजाङ्ग दिया करेन सेवन ।
अतएव मधुर रसे हय पञ्चगुण ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. १९.

[16] युगायितं निमिषेण चक्षुषा प्रावृषायितम् ।
शून्यायितं जगत् सर्व्वं गोविन्दविरहेण मे ॥—श्रीचै., अ., प. २०.

Next let us pass on to the secondary *rasas*. According to the Vaiṣṇava teachers the secondary *rasas* are seven in number. They are *hāysa* (ludicrous), *adbhuta* (sublime), *vīra* (heroic), *karuṇa* (pathetic), *raudra* (furious), *bībhatsa* (abominable), and *bhayānaka* (terrible). These secondary *rasas* have no independent existence of their own. They only occasionally arise in devotees fit for enjoying the five kinds of permanent *rasas* referred to above.

हास्याद्भुत वीर करुण रौद्र वीभत्स भय ।
पञ्चविध भक्ते गौण सप्तरस हय ॥
पञ्चरस स्थायी व्यापी रहे भक्तमने ।
सप्तगौण आगन्तुक पाइये कारणे ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. १८.

We have given above a short outline of the different stages of loving devotion. Now the question arises, how can all these stages of loving devotion be practically attained in life ? How can their sweetness be enjoyed by us in life ? According to the Vaiṣṇava teachers of Bengal the first stage of loving devotion is called *rati* or *bhāva*. The *rati* or *bhāva* enables one to see God :

प्रेमाङ्कुरे रति भाव हय दुइ नाम ।
याहा हैते वश हन श्रीभगवान् ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. २२.

Now a further question arises, how is *rati* generated ? Śrī Chaitanya tells us that when the time for the removal of one's bondage arrives, the seeker comes across a real *sādhu* or saint and through the grace of that *sādhu* he comes to attain the first stage of divine love.

कोन भाग्ये कारो संसार क्षयोन्मुख हय ।
साधु सङ्गे तब कृष्णे रति उपजय ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. २२.

But what are the characteristics of a real *sādhu*? A real *sādhu* partakes of the nature of God. He is the temple of God and in him God dwells for ever. He knows not of anything else but God.

ईश्वरस्वरूप भक्त ताँर अधिष्ठान ।
भक्तेर हृदये कृष्णेर सतत विश्राम ॥
श्रीचै., आ., प. १.

St. Paul makes a similar observation with regard to true Christians :

"Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"[16]

When an earnest seeker comes in contact with a real *sādhu*, and goes on in his *sādhanā* or devotion under his guidance, he first obtain *rati* and subsequently obtains *preman* which is nothing but the ripe stage of *rati*. *Preman* or wholehearted love towards God is the only object of our attainment.

सेइ रति गाढ़ हइले धरे प्रेम नाम ।
सेइ प्रेमा प्रयोजन सर्व्वानन्द धाम ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. २३

Gradually the devotee is enabled to reach all the stages of loving devotion referred to above, even that of *mahābhāva* which is regarded as the highest of all. It may appear strange to many that Śrī Chaitanya teaches that no one can attain to the love of God without the assistance of a *sādhu* or saint. Not only Śrī Chaitanya but almost all the religious teachers of the world have inculcated the same lesson. We read in the *Mohamudgara*—a short religious poem traditionally ascribed to the great intellectual giant Śaṅkara of India—that one can cross the ocean of earthly existence

[16] *Corinthian* 3, I.

through the spiritual help of a *sādhu* alone.[17] On turning to Europe we find that Jesus of Nazareth teaches in unequivocal terms that no one can see the Kingdom of Heaven unless he is born again in spirit and thus that great Teacher has in effect recognised the regeneration of a man through the help of a saint in whom the Spirit of God dwells. Plato, one of the greatest philosophers of Europe, was an ardent worshipper of Beauty. In his *Dialogue* the named the *Symposium* and *Phædrus* he has given us his ideas regarding the worship of the Beautiful. The following quotation from Jowett's translation of the *Phædrus* will show a saint in connection with the worship of God as Beauty :—

"But he whose initiation is recent, and who has been the spectator of many glories in the other world, is amazed when he sees any one having a golden face or form, which is the expression of divine beauty; and at first a shudder runs through him, and again the old awe steals over him; then looking upon the face of his beloved as of a god he reverences him ; and, if he were not afraid of being thought a downright mad man, he would sacrifice to his beloved as to the image of a god ; then while he gazes on him there is a sort of reaction, and the shudder passes into an unusual heat and perspiration ; for, as he receives the effluence of beauty through the eyes, the eye moistens and he weeps."[18]

Hāfiz of Shirāz, an ardent worshipper of God as Beauty, also testifies to the necessity of a *murshid* or spiritual guide. In fact most of the religious teachers of the world have admitted the necessity of a spiritual guide in the course of the seeker's journey towards God and in view of their teachings it deserves serious consideration of thinking men.

One word more and I have done. From the above short exposition of the *rasa*-cult it follows that with the exception of the *śānta* devotee, the main attitude of whose soul towards

[17] क्षणमिह सज्जन सङ्गतिरेका । भवति भवार्णवतरणे नौका ॥

[18] *Phædrus*, Vol. I, p. 457.

God is one of reverence, and who views his God as infinitely superior to him in knowledge and power, all other kinds of devotees are worshippers of God in some finite shape. In other words they offer their loving worship to God who reveals Himself to His devotees in some definite form of unspeakable beauty and grace. They in reality worship one whom they can serve, whom they can approach as a Friend without the least fear and awe, whom they can marry and serve by their whole spiritual selves. Unless God has a definite size, infinitely charming, how is it possible for them to enter into all these loving relations? Hence the question naturally comes up, is it possible for God, who is infinite and all-powerful according to all accounts, to appear before his devotees in an exquisitely beautiful form? On turning to Europe we find that the greatest thinkers of Europe, like Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Hamilton and others have made a distinction between the conception of the Beautiful and the Sublime. According to them the Beautiful is the shining forth of the spirit in some particular form, and the Sublime is what is absolutely, or beyond all conception, great, that compared with which all else is small.[19] The Beautiful calms and pacifies us, but the Sublime brings disorder into our faculties and overawes us. In the opinion of the greatest thinkers of Europe that which is infinitely great gives us only the emotion of the Sublime and not that of the Beautiful. Consequently God in His infinitude cannot possibly satisfy those who are worshippers of His Beauty. All lovers of beauty and those who are really competent to speak with authority tell us that God's infinitude arouses in us the sentiment of the Sublime and not that of the Beautiful. Hence it follows that worship of God as Beauty is not possible unless He has a definite form of some sort, fitted to call forth our sentiment of the beautiful. If God is essentially infinite, His worship

[19] See *Saundarya Tattva* (in Bengalee) by the present writer, pp. 208 to 214, where the subject has been treated in some details.

as Beauty is impossible. But the devotees of all the countries of the world have worshipped God as Beauty and Love from the earliest times. If the worship of God as Beauty is feasible, then He must be supposed to have some spiritual form of exquisite beauty which can be enjoyed by His devotees. Thus there is an apparent difficulty. How can it be solved? The Vaiṣṇava teachers of Bengal have very creditably solved the difficulty. They tell us that God has two forms—finite and infinite. The one who is finite in appearance, is essentially infinite and the one who is infinite is also finite. He is both finite and infinite at the same time.

य एव विग्रहव्यापी परिच्छिन्नः स एव हि ।
एकस्यैवैकदा चास्य द्विरूपत्वं विराजते ॥
श्रीरूप गोस्वामी, लघुभागवतामृतम्.

Those who want to worship God as Infinite think of His infinite powers and knowledge, and those who worship Him as Love and Beauty conceive Him as a finite Person of exquisite beauty. There is nothing incongruous in the conception that He is both finite and infinite. On the other hand, it is the most legitimate conception. Finite involves infinite, and infinite involves finite. His finite form is but a focus, is but a centre, of His infinite form. Hence one cannot be divorced from the other. Further, all the religious scriptures of the world view God as all-powerful. If he is all-powerful, the combination of finitude and infinitude in Him cannot be regarded as an impossibility. That God is infinite is hardly contended by the theists. But when it is said that God can reveal Himself in finite form to His devotees it is unpalatable to a section of them. But they do not see that the worship of God as Beauty and Love presupposes such a form. Let the reasoning of this class of thinkers say anything it likes, but the fact, as it is, cannot be overlooked. It appears from the religious scriptures of the world that God has revealed

Himself to his whole-hearted devotees in finite forms of exquisite beauty. We read in the *New Testament* that when Jesus was baptized the heavens were opened unto him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him and he further heard a voice saying, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." It is important to note that Jesus saw God in the form of a *dove*.

It is recorded of St. Catherine of Siena that she used to commune with Christ, who taught her "by means of a clear bodily appearance," with such fervour that she would "pass into the state of ecstacy," and remain unconscious for hours together.[20] Hafiz of Persia speaks of God having "a stature, tall and beautiful, a face, gracious and heart-alluring, and the eye (in a bow) sweetly drawn."[21] God Kṛṣṇa of Śri Chaitanya is an embodiment of Truth, Light, and Bliss. He has a spiritual body composed of all that is sweet and beautiful in the universe visible or invisible. There is nothing inauspicious or carnal in Him. He can be seen, heard, touched, smelt, and even tasted. In short His Beauty can be enjoyed by the whole spiritual nature. These spiritual experiences are not mere figures of speech, but they are facts. The mystics of Europe also refer to spiritual experiences of similar nature. Ribot speaks of "Divine touches" and Scramelli says that "they are but purely spiritual sensations by which the soul feels the intimate presence of God and tastes Him with great delight."[22] St. Paul alludes to "celestial bodies," and also to "terrestrial bodies." The glory of the celestial is one and that of the latter is of a different kind. Śrī Chaitanya speaks of *bhakta deha* or *divya deha*, and he adds further that one who comes to possess a

[20] Father Raimond, *Life of St. Catterine*, and also Dr. D. C. Sen, *Chaitanya and His Companions*, p. 167.

[21] Ode 486, c. 3, (Clarke's translation).

[22] Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, p. 371, and Rai Saheb D. C. Sen, *Vaiṣṇava Literature of Medieval Bengal*.

spiritual body fit for loving worship of Kṛṣṇa becomes drawn towards Kṛṣṇa and finally obtains Him.

भक्तदेह पाइले हय गुणेर स्मरण ।
गुणाकृष्ट हैया करे निर्म्मल भजन ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. २५.

भक्तिबले प्राप्तस्वरूप दिव्यदेह पाय ।
कृष्णे गुणाकृष्ट हैया भजे कृष्ण पाय ॥
श्रीचै., म., प. २४.

The "celestial body" referred to by St. Paul is nothing but the bhakta deha of Śrī Chaitaniya. God Kṛṣṇa is not an object of external sense, but is an object of the inner faculty of Love. To serve and love Him by the whole spiritual nature for love's sake is the principal teaching of the Vaiṣṇavas. The Vaiṣṇavas want to draw near to Him and to touch His feet. They want to become His slaves and to offer Him their loving service. They long for His sweet friendship and intimacy, and desire to make Him an object of whole-hearted affection. Above all they seek His spiritual embrace and want to be united to Him in spirit for ever. Plato, some five centuries before the dawn of the Christian era, inquired, "if a man had the eyes to see the true beauty—the divine beauty, I mean, pure and clear and unalloyed, not clogged with the pollutions of mortality and the colours and vanities of human life—thither looking; and holding converse with the true beauty simple and divine".[23] What was but a dream, a vision to Plato, has been proclaimed as a reality by Śrī Chaitanya. This great sage testifies that man possesses eyes of *bhakti* to see the Beauty of God and to hold unceasing converse with the true Beauty simple and divine. He further teaches that a whole-hearted devotee can enter into various

[23] Plato, *Symposium*, Jowett's translation.

kinds of loving relations with God and enjoy His Love and Beauty by his whole spiritual nature. Let the holy Name of Hari be glorified. It is His holy Name that enables one to obtain the true path.

The recent European war has taught us discord that material science and material happiness lead but to destruction and they cannot afford any real peace and happiness. On the cessation of this horrible and heart-rendering, the whole world is in need of some soothing and sweet notes which can effectively calm the passion-nature of men and prove a source of permanent joy and happiness to mankind. They have already been sounded by Śrī Chaitanya in a sufficiently vivid and alluring form, and we hope that their music and sweetness will have due appreciation.

THE CITY BEAUTIFUL.

(A Tamil Panegyric Lyric.)

C. P. Venkatarama Aiyar, M.A., L.T.,

Head Master, Government Secondary Training School, Saidapet, Madras.

Among the many notable classics of the early period of Tāmil literature, which were rescued from oblivion and deciphered from many stray cadjan manuscripts and published to the immense delight of the Tāmil world by the great Tāmil scholar of the day, Pandit Mahāmahopādhyāya Brahma Sri V. Swaminatha Ayyar Avergal, the *Pattupāṭṭu*,—literally the ten songs—claims our attention, first and foremost, as essentially a literary picture of the condition of the Tāmil land in the early centuries of the Christian era. In this collection of songs there are lyrics—religious, erotic, as well as panegyric.

The particular poem which has been taken up for study here, is the ninth of the series, and is known as *Paṭṭinappālai*. In it the poet adopts a novel plan of admiring the beauties of the ancient city of Kāveripūmpaṭṭinam and its suburbs. He says that he holds the city very dear in his love, only second to his attachment for his partner in life. After giving a glowing picture of the city, he tells us that he would not leave his partner, and roam in distant lands for gain or profit, even for a short time, if by doing so, he was assured the priceless gift of the great city of Kāveripūmpaṭṭinam itself.

This city was the seat of Government of a very powerful Chola monarch who is mentioned with considerable regard and love in the literary works of other contemporary writers. It was a natural harbour and a great centre of trade in those ancient times. Situated as it was, most picturesquely, on the banks of the river Kāverī where the beautiful river which contributes to the prosperity of the land emptied its waters into the sea, the city occupied a prominent place in the affections

of the Tāmil people, as well as the merchants of the different parts of the world, who had business relations with the city.

In his Variorum Edition of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, Dr. Furness quotes from an English traveller a very telling passage which describes the city of Venice and its glories in those ancient times. Readers of Shakespeare may be able to form in their minds a sufficiently vivid picture of the city of Venice from the passage referred to. The English traveller Coryat thus describes Venice: "This incomparable city, this most beautiful queen, this untainted virgin, this Paradise, this Temple, this rich diadem and most flourishing garland of Christendom." He concludes with stating, that if four of the richest manors in Somersetshire, where he was born, should have been bestowed upon him if he never saw Venice, he would say that "seeing Venice was worth them all."

To those who pursue the most stimulating comparative study of the literatures of the East and the West, such parallel ideas are very interesting. The great Tāmil poet has placed his admiration for the beautiful city on a very superb pedestal in the affections of his heart. Whereas the description of the city of Venice is mainly of its outward beauties, the description of the Chola capital by the Tāmil poet is not only of the outward aspect but what is more pleasing, it is a faithful portraiture of the soul of the city, its inhabitants and its trade, as well as of the beauty of the river Kāverī which gave its name to the city.

The poet Kaḍialūr Uruthiran Kaṇṇinār who addressed this lyric to the great Chola king is said to have been suitably rewarded by that great patron of learning, who gave the poet the magnificent present of sixteen lakhs of gold coins of the day. It is hard to say who deserves the most praise—the poet who has produced this masterpiece of a song, or the munificent patron who appreciated it so generously. Surely both the poet and the patron have placed posterity under a deep debt of gratitude for all that they have done for literature and culture.

The poem is remarkable on account of its many literary

excellences which can be well appreciated only in the language in which it is written. More than this, it is of considerable historic importance. Written in an age when Tāmil literature was widely read and appreciated, and addressed to a king who ruled over a very prosperous and highly civilized people, the poem is at once interesting and instructive. It is interesting as throwing a flood of light on the domestic life of the people in those days, their pastimes, their commerce and other national traits. It is highly instructive on account of its containing very vivid descriptions of nature and as affording a key to the better understanding of the human element through the medium of Nature.

The one absorbing topic of the poem is, the peace the country was enjoying under the powerful rule of Cholan Karikārperuvaḷathān, who knew no foe and whose supremacy was recognised throughout the land and by many princes and rulers. Internal peace led to commercial prosperity and some of the poet's immortal lines are those which relate to the commerce of the people.

The export and import trade, the very busy market, the unceasing tour of the loyal customs officers of Government, and the commercial probity of merchants and traders, are all very well described in the poem, as also the friendly relations which subsisted between the local traders and foreigners, their mutual social amenities and the general condition of the masses. The poet has something to say on each and every subject—administration, commerce, and the condition of the people. The poem is a very true and faithful picture of the condition of the people in the Tāmil country in the age of king Karikārperuvaḷathān.

Judging from the poem, it would appear that there was then regular bartering of paddy and salt in the South. Horses were largely imported. There was considerable trade with foreign countries in pepper, precious metals and stones, sandal wood, pearls and coral. Camphor, rose water and

similar products were largely imported from China and other distant lands (lines 29-31; 185-193).

The many flags in the ships laden with cargo, which anchored in the harbour presented a very lively and beautiful sight. The market was very busy throughout the day. Merchants from foreign countries and speaking many languages, settled down in the country and their relations, commercial and personal, with the local traders were very friendly and cordial. They seem to have enjoyed each other's company very heartily. The poet conveys this idea in exquisitely simple and telling words (lines 216-218).

The merchants were very God-fearing and honest in their dealings. They never spoke an untruth. They loudly proclaimed the cost price of an article and gave out without any reserve whatsoever, the profit they wished to make out of a transaction. They feared to speak an untruth lest the sin of uttering falsehood should harm their class. They appear to have very jealously guarded their credit and honesty in their commercial transactions. They will give only so much of any article as the purchaser will reasonably expect them to give and in their turn in their own purchases they would see that they do not get more than what is reasonable. The great difficulty in appraising a thing will be evident when we remember that all commerce was then done by means of bartering and all honour is due to those traders who preserved their credit, honesty and truth, amidst great temptations to act to the contrary. The merchants gloried in making fortunes by *fair means.* The high moral tone of the merchant class is a sufficient index of the prosperity of the country. Customs officers and appraisers were very busy with their duties of collection. They went from one ship to another, collecting duties as the busy bee collects honey from flowers. The seal then obtaining was the figure of a tiger imprinted on a piece of wood. Government officers had great confidence in the integrity of the merchants they were dealing with (line 135).

Turning to the prosperity of the people in general, the agricultural class was well off. Their agricultural implements and cattle were in good condition. The poet has two most musical lines to describe the courtyards in the small huts of the farmers, where their bulls were tied to wooden pegs driven fast into the earth, and straw and water supplied to them. These lines show that the poet was passionately fond of the people, and, especially he loved the agricultural class from the bottom of his heart. They tilled the soil. It is the poet's love for this class which makes him compare the right path of virtue and single-hearted straight-forwardness to the nail which is tightly fixed right in the centre of the yoke of the farmer's plough (lines 205-209).

The poet is very sympathetic with the agricultural class. Like Robert Burns, Uruthiran Kaṇṇinār is essentially a poet of the poor,—full of admiration for their virtue and in perfect sympathy with their aspirations. His love for them is always intense and alive, and his descriptions of the streets inhabited by the poor are as sympathetic as they are realistic. He faithfully describes the narrow courtyards of the huts of the poor, filled with cowdung and straw, as well as the spacious courtyards in the splendid buildings of the rich, where, the children, well-fed and nursed, and adorned with anklets, learn to walk with the help of the three-wheeled go-cart. The contrast is no doubt implied, if not expressed. The poet describes all classes of people from the highest to the lowest. He describes tersely the life of the middle classes who get their round of pleasures in the periodical festivals in the temples. But his sympathy is ever with the poor and he describes in full the inner life of the peasant, the artisan and the fisherman. The poet describes most heartily the daily life of the fishermen. They did not lead a hand to mouth existence throughout the year. They salted and dried fish and carried on some trade in fish. Though they depended on the yield of the sea for their maintenance, yet as that yield was plentiful, they lived very happily. They could even

enjoy a holiday from work. The poet is their best friend, and he describes most graphically, the pleasures of this class of people. He is full of sympathy for them, and he is in raptures to tell us about the innocent pleasuses of the sea-bath and frolic, which fishermen so thoroughly enjoy. With his keen sense of perception and sympathetic understanding of the lot of the fishermen, the poet describes how they enjoy a holiday in company with their friends and relatives. On full-moon days they abstain from going out to sea, attire themselves in holiday clothing, and make themselves merry. They rest their angling rods and nets on the walls of their low-roofed huts, and deck themselves with the wild flowers which grow profusely along the sea shore. They swim on the waves all day to their heart's content and at sunset get drunk and hear action songs and witness dramas, sitting upon raised places, and in their absence, upon the tops of their boats, in the clear moon light. They thus spend their holidays and enjoy life.

The poem is a *praise lyric*. The main topic is the prosperity of the country under the rule of Karikārperuvaḷathān. It has the personal note and musical character which are the essential qualities of a lyric. Further there is the subjective feeling of the sorrows of separation from the beloved (lines 218-220), which the poet improvises in the praise lyric to suit his special aim.

There is a natural grace and springing movement about the lines. There are in the poem some noble attempts at a pure and faithful description of nature. In it nature is described in language which is at once exquisitely simple and terse. The poet describes in a straightforward manner the huts of the villagers and the streets in which they inhabit. The great merit of his description is that the verse shows no signs at all of any laboured skill. There is a wonderful spontaneity in the diction. There is no overloading of ornament, everything is pure and natural. There is real music in the verse, and often the sound and the sense are in complete accord.

The poet's descriptions are very vivid and real. He is a master in the art of giving the incommunicable touch to prose

which makes all the difference between prose and poetry. Gifted with a keen imagination, the poet's similies are very apt and telling. He compares the dark coloured nets of the fishermen spread over the white sands in the moon light, to the dark spot in the moon. A better comparison could hardly be imagined. And there is a natural ease and beauty of simplicity in the comparison.

Great as his literary excellences are, the glory of Uruthiran Kaṇṇinar shall always lie in his passionate love of the people. He towers head and shoulders over other poets in this particular. The human element is strongly marked in this short poem. Nature is only the background for showing in bold relief the living mass of people, with their struggles and aspirations in life. The poet has a sympathetic understanding of the lot of the poor. In describing nature he sang the epic of man.

His love for children is unbounded. There are not many poets who can so thoroughly enjoy in the company of young children, and understand their minds. He loves to see the children of the rich try to walk with the help of the go-cart. But his love for the children of the poor, who also have their round of pleasures, is even greater. He describes in most musical lines, the children of fishermen strolling along the sea shore in quest of living edible shells and collecting wild flowers in their innocent rambles. The lines read as though the poet himself followed the boys with glee in all their rambles. The imagination is most pleasing, especially as the lines have a lively springing movement about them which is in complete consonance with the gay hop of careless romping children (lines 63-65).

The poet is all love for his king whom he holds in most affectionate regard. But he does not admire Karikārperuvaḷathān for his military prowess alone. Nor does he praise him solely for his immense fortune which was the envy of others less gifted with the wordly goods. But the poet admires and praises his king for his real work for the benefit of the public which gained for him the staunch adhesion of the subjects of his realm. Karikārperuvaḷathān appears to have

been a very enlightened monarch. His appreciation of this exquisite Tāmil poem, so faithfully describing the condition of the country, is in itself poor to show that he was a great patron of learning and that he was himself well learned. The king cleared many forests and built cities in their places. He dug public tanks and wells and looked after the unfailing water supply for purposes of irrigation. He encouraged art and learning by very munificent donations. He renovated old tanks and in many ways sought to make his people prosperous and contented. He built temples and made provision for periodical festivals in them. He thus won the hearts of the people by his own anxious care for their welfare. Herein lay his secret of success. The ruler was very popular with his subjects and was well loved by them. He was thus able not only to hold his own against many other rulers over independent tracts, but also to conquer and annex their territories if he chose. Many other rulers were paying annual tribute to this mighty king and acknowledged his overlordship. Even the once mighty Pandan kings were no equal for him (line 287). The poet gives much space in his poem to the many public acts of the king as well as a description of his many military glories. This shows that the poet admired that phase of his king's character where he sought internal peace and prosperity before launching upon external wars.

There are many Tāmil poets gifted equally with Uruthiran Kaṇṇinār, with a high imaginative perception and command of language. But the merit of the author of the Paṭṭinappālai in this as well as in another panegyric lyric included as the fourth song in the collection of the "Ten Songs", lies chiefly in his simple and telling description of the daily lives of the several classes of peoples, wherein his keen insight and sympathy are very remarkably revealed. And in this particular the poet enjoys a honoured place in the galaxy of ancient Tāmil bards.

IS NOT 'PURE SELF' ACTIVE IN THE VEDANTA SYSTEM ?

BY

KOKILESWAR SASTRI, M.A.,

Lecturer in Sanskrit and in Hindu Philosophy, Calcutta University.

In the first volume of the *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver-Jubilee Volumes* published by the Calcutta University, Professor W. S. Urquhart, D. Phil., has written a very lucid and instructive article entited—"*Sankara and Prof. James Ward.*" In this article he has, with great ability, shown some parallels "between the two master minds" regarding the doctrine of the Self as held by the two philosophers. As a result of discussion, he comes to the conclusion that "the essential point of difference between the two philosophers is that Dr. Ward emphasises the activity of the self, whereas Sankara refuses to allow that the Self is an agent." "That in the system of Sankara," the Professor continues, "his individual self is dissociated from the idea of activity" and that "Sankara regards the self as merely a pure knowledge or intelligence," and this, he supposes, is due to "Sankara's insufficient attention to his own principles." Now, with all due deference to the opinion of this renowned philosopher, we feel it incumbent upon ourselves to submit that this is a conclusion which appears to us to be most astounding and we regret to observe that we do not find our way to accept this conclusion. We purpose in this article to carefully examine this position and to see whether this supposition finds any support from the writings of Sankara himself.

(1) The self is ordinarily regarded as a self-contained entity existing on its own account. It is merely a bundle of passive feelings and states and possesses a fund of impulses and passions which constitute the source of its physical and mental movements or activities. It is continuous with, and a part of, the external nature which has equipped it with its organs of sense and the nervous system. When the organs of sense come in contact with the external environment (विषयेन्द्रिय सम्पर्क), the latter elicits certain states and activities in the former and these actions and reactions constitute the self.[1] This is the actual empirical self. According to Sankara, it is not the *real* self ; and he calls it कर्त्तृत्व-भोक्तृत्व-विशिष्ट जीव and it is आत्मा अपरमार्थः.[2] The *agency* disclosed in its activities is not the true agency at all, for all the elements constituting this कर्त्तृत्व determine, and are determined by, one another in an unbroken series of mechanical causality. What this self does at the present moment is but the necessary outcome of his motive and character (प्रकृति) formed in the past. "एवथा......कामः येन प्रयुक्तः अवश इव......वहिर्मुखः न स्वंलोकं प्रति जानाति" (वृ० भा०, १।४।१७)। This self is not free to choose the *End* of its life (पुरुषार्थसाधनप्रतिपत्तावसामर्थ्यं परवशीकृतचित्तस्य)।

But *Brahma* is revealed and indwells in man in the form of infinite "ज्ञानैश्वर्य" *hidden* in him,—in the form of infinite ideals of truth, beauty and goodness.[3] These indwelling ज्ञानैश्वर्यs, these ideals—are gradually being revealed in man in higher and higher forms and they are carrying the man to infinite possibilities in future. The infinite Brahma is thus immanent in man and it is for this presence that we

[1] "श्रोत्रादीनि इन्द्रियाणि—मात्राः। मात्राणां स्पर्शाः—शब्दादिभिः संयोगाः।" (गीता)॥ "विषयेन्द्रियोपाधिसम्बन्धजनितेन अन्तःकरणगताभिव्यक्त—'विशेषविज्ञानेन' विज्ञानमयत्वां बुद्धिं व्याप्नोति" (वृ० भा०)।

[2] Sankara calls this self as भूतमात्रासंसर्गजनितः and मनोमयादिपञ्चकोषविशिष्टः। This is regarded by him as *passive* self and the real self is what underlies it.

[3] "जीवस्य ज्ञानैश्वर्यतिरोभावः देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिविषयवेदनायोगात्" (वे० भा०, ३।२।५)। 'स्वरूपस्य अनपायित्वात्, उपाधिकृतस्वरूपतिरोभावात्" (३।२।५) ॥

do not feel content with our actual situation and seek higher and higher ends. The ज्ञान-शक्ति-सौन्दर्य्य etc., as we *actually* find them manifested in human nature are all imperfect, broken and fragmentary. But the ज्ञानैश्वर्य्य—which lies hidden deep behind, in man, is infinite and inexhaustible and hence the two can not be identified. Yet we identify the two, and the indwelling infinite ज्ञानैश्वर्य्य which constitutes the *real Self* and which is the moving force within us becomes concealed, and the *actual* human nature as expressed in deeds and words is all-in-all to us, and future possibilities are thus shut out. But the pursuit of knowledge more and more, the quest of beauty in higher and higher forms which no finite object can perfectly satisfy, our infinite capacity and work for higher and higher ends, our dissatisfaction with mundane goods—all these prove the presence of *Brahma* in us in a newer way, such that it was never present in the lower animals in the same manner. Sankara points out—"The supreme self is *revealed* in the spirit of man in a higher and superior form. It is for this presence that man ever wants to *know* more and more and by mundane means ever to reach what is supra-mundane. By his higher and higher *works* and pursuits he desires to realise higher and higher *ends* until all his pursuits are directed to the realisation of the Supreme *End*."—

"प्राधान्यात्। किं पुनः प्राधान्यं (पुरुषे)? कर्म्मज्ञानाधिकारः। पुरुष एव हि शक्तत्वात्, अर्थित्वात्, अपर्य्युदस्तत्वाच्च, अर्थी विद्वान् समर्थः...पुरुषे त्वेव आविस्तरामात्मा। स हि प्रज्ञानेन सम्पन्नतमः विज्ञानं पश्यति श्वस्तनं... मर्त्येन अमृतमीप्सति। अथ इतरेषां पशूनां अशना-पिपासे एव अभिविज्ञानं" (तै॰, भा॰, २।१)।

Then again—

"पूर्व्वपूर्व्वप्रवृत्तिनिरोधेन उत्तरोत्तरापूर्व्वप्रवृत्तिजननस्य प्रत्यगात्माभिमुख्येन प्रवृत्त्युत्पादनार्थत्वात्" (गी॰ भा॰, १८।६६)।

And he further adds that "to other animals, their knowledge and action are limited to present eating and enjoyment."

Brahma thus indwells in us as Ideals or End; and this End is the 'higher Self'—the real nature of man. This nature underlies all his manifested states and activities. This end or purpose lying hidden in man carries the man to infinite possibilities in future. As मृत्तिका moves to realise its future ideal घट, which lies hidden in its nature, so the ideal which is inherent in man's nature gradually works out its end. This end thus is the moving force or the real agent in man. "सर्व्वप्रवृत्तीनां.. ......आत्मावगत्यवसानार्थत्वात् ।" *i. e.*, the realisation of Brahma in our self—the ब्रह्मात्मैकत्व—is the पुरुषार्थ or the final end of our life.[1] Now this 'higher Self' or the end is our real self lying behind our states and activities.[2] It is present as purposive power or end of our life. It is not a slave like the empirical self, but is the true determining agent. It is not in time-series but above it. It can introduce a new element or a difference in the time-series. Its actions are not determined by antecedents in time. It can direct the natural courses of the functions of its organs and lead them to the realisation of its own 'purpose.' "स्वाभाविकात् कार्य्यकरणप्रवृत्तिगोचरात् विमुखीकृत्य, प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्त्तयति" (वे० भा०, १।१।४)। "कार्य्यकरणसंघातस्य स्वभावेन सर्व्वतः प्रवृत्तस्य—सन्मार्गे एव नियोगः" (गी० भा०, १३।७)।

Here in this connection we should like to invite our reader's attention to an invaluable opinion of Sankara which occurs frequently in his Bhāsya. We mean how Sankara has drawn out a distinction between the respective

[1] "अन्यमिदं...मातःपरं किञ्चित् 'आकाङ्क्ष्य' अस्ति।" (वे० भा०, ४।१।१४)। "ब्रह्मावगतिर्हि पुरुषार्थः, अवगतिपर्य्यन्तं ज्ञानं" (१।१।१)। "नहि एकत्वावगमतो सत्यां...पुरुषार्थसमाप्तिबुद्ध्युत्पत्तेः" (४।१।१४)॥ This is called 'पर्य्यन्त'—The *final* End. "ज्ञेयमेव ज्ञातं सत् ज्ञान'फलं' भवति" (गीता० भा०)।

[2] These states and activities can not *really conceal* it. "संघातव्यतिरिक्तस्य स्वतन्त्रस्य इच्छामात्रेणैव मन-आदिप्रे-... 'इतानां परार्थत्वात्" (केन० भा०, १।२)।

characteristics of the sentient self (चेतन) and the insentient elements of nature (अचेतन). The reader would do well to bear these characteristic features carefully in his mind. He has characterised the चेतन or the self as स्वार्थ, that is to say, it exists *for itself* and it has the *purpose* or the reason of its existence in itself. The चेतन is also described as स्वतःसिद्ध or नित्यसिद्ध, *i. e.*, it is self-existent and self-sufficient and does not depend for this existence on any other thing. In *contrast* with this characteristic mark of the चेतन, he has called the अचेतन or the insentient elements as परार्थ, *i. e.*, existing and working *for something else* which is distinct from these in its nature ; or in other words, which works and exists for the good of something *other than* these. He has pointed out the fact that the अचेतन has no *purpose* of its own,—अचेतने स्वार्थानुपपत्तेः। He has thus described the nature of *purpose* inherent in ब्रह्म's nature :—स्वात्मनोऽनन्याः कामाः।[1] Brahma is *purpose* itself. "As *our* desires or purposes are dependent on their stimulating causes beyond them ; as these, when elicited, control us ;"—"such," he says, "is not the purpose of Brahma, which is अनन्य to its nature, *i.e.*, not distinct or separate from the nature of Brahma. And this purpose is entirely dependent on Brahma and it is Brahma which directs or controls it." Now, the manifested nature and its elements, being परार्थ, are not self-sufficient and independent at all, but are constantly dependent on the sentient self whose purpose they serve. They have only an instrumental value,—are mere means or medium through which the purpose of the self is realised. If you deny this, "what are परार्थ in their nature would themselves be स्वार्थ and would be meaningless." "स्वार्थाः सर्व्वाः प्रवृत्तयः व्यर्थाः प्रसज्येरन्।" "Pleasure and pain and the like would in that case work and exist for the sake of pleasure and pain" etc.

[1] "कामाः...कथं तर्हि? सत्य-ज्ञानलक्षणाः स्वात्मभूतत्वाद्विशुद्धाः"—(तै० भा०, २।६)।—Thus the Purpose is ब्रह्म's *nature*.

(गी० भा०, 18.50). "न च देहाद्यचेतनार्थत्वं शक्यं कल्पयितुं । न च सुखार्थं सुखं, दुःखार्थं वा दुःखं ।" From these observations of Sankara it irresistably follows that nature and the changes or differentiations of the world are to be regarded as *means* or *medii* or *instruments* for the realisation of the *purpose* of Brahma; that this purpose is realising itself gradually through the differences or stages of nature. All the elements within the organisms also, exist and work together for the realisation of the purpose of the self which controls them[1].

The important truth just noted may also be gathered from Sankara's comment on the Vedanta-Sutra, 4.3.14. In this commentary, Sankara shows Brahma to be the Supreme goal or end. When this goal is reached, all desires are satisfied and no further desire arises beyond this. "न भूयः काचिदाकाङ्क्षा उपजायते, पुरुषार्थ-समाप्तिबुद्ध्युत्पत्तेः ।" Here in Brahma the end of human life gets final satisfaction. Thus the चेतन Brahma and the human self are both called purpose or end. But, he observes in the same commentary, that it is otherwise with the created world. "नैवमुत्पत्त्यादि-श्रुतीनां निराकाङ्क्षत्वप्रतिपादन-सामर्थ्यमस्ति ।" That is to say, the idea of end, the idea of final realisation—is not to be met with within the sphere of nature and its elements. For this idea lies *beyond* it. As nature is progressively moving to the final goal which lies *beyond* it, no one of its elements can give you the *final* satisfaction. This remark implies that nature is परार्थ,—a *means* for the realisation of the final good or end; for, it gives rise to the idea of something which lies as its *source* and which lies as its final *goal* to which it is moving.[2]

[1] We invite our reader's attention to the *Bhāsya* on केन० उप०, stanza I. Sankara here distinctly calls the real Self as Purpose or End or Ideal which directs our impulses, organs, *manas*, etc. for the realisation of its own End. " स्वतन्त्रस्य 'इच्छा'मात्रेणैव मन-आदि-प्रेषयितृत्वं " etc. etc. etc. Throughout this Upanishad and its Bhāsya, this Self is called प्रेषयिता, *i.e.*, active Power.

[2] "नैवमुत्पत्त्यादिश्रुतीनां नैराकाङ्क्ष्यप्रतिपादनसामर्थ्यमस्ति......नेदमग्रं भविष्यतीति"—इत्यादि ।—*i.e.*, the manifested or created elements invariably involve the idea of a purpose or end *beyond* them which has *not* been realised yet,

The above discussion clearly shows that inasmuch as the self is held by Sankara to be a purposive power, and as all other objects and elements besides the self are regarded a means for the realisation of the purpose of the self, it follows that we must *use* the actions of our organs, passions and impulses in a way that our highest purpose may be realised through them. It is therefore the *true agent.*

(2) We think that to every careful reader of the commentaries of Sankara the fact that a finite individual, be it a thing or a self, has a distinct *nature* of its own will stand out most prominently. It is impossible for a reader to escape this fact. This *nature* Sankara holds to be नित्य or permanent in the sense that it retains its unity and preserves its identity in the successive changes of its manifested states and activities which it underlies. This nature, Sankara is careful to point out, is not at all dependent on anything beyond or external to it ; neither is it *produced,* like its states and activities, by an external stimulus or the environment with which it is put into relation. It not only retains its unity in its changing states, it *continues* to live in each of its successive states evoked from it. But such is not the case with its states and activities. These are transient and impermanent ; these are produced on the occasion of the action of the environment.[1] But they are not produced out of nothing (असत्), there must be something underlying them, out of which they are produced or manifested. This underlying *nature* is called by Sankara as स्वरूप, धर्म्म or स्वभाव । Sometimes the word सामान्य is used to denote this nature. Throughout his system, the term कारण or cause invariably refers to this nature. As it transcends its states, it is sometimes called कूटस्थ । This is how he describes

[1] "यत् कदाचिदभिव्यज्यते···आत्मभूतं तदिति, अन्यतोऽभिव्यक्तिप्रसङ्गः, तथाच अभिव्यक्ति-साधनापेक्षता ।···इदन्तु आत्मभूतमेव...नित्याभिव्यक्तत्वात्" । बृ०, ४।४।२ ।

"न हि यस्य यः स्वभावो निश्चितः, स तं व्यभिचरति कदाचिदपि" (२।१।१५) ।

this nature and contrasts it with its states :—"The real in a thing is that which does not depend on any other thing and which is permanent. It does not change its character under any circumstances, but maintains it. What appears or is produced by an external operative cause and is thus dependent on it is not the *nature* of the thing."—

"द्रव्यस्य हि तत्त्वमविक्रिया—परानपेक्षत्वात्। विक्रिया न तत्त्वं—परापेक्षत्वात्। न हि कारकापेक्षं वस्तुनस्तत्त्वं। सतो विशेषः कारकापेक्षः, विशेषश्च—विक्रिया।...यद्धि यस्य नान्यापेक्षं स्वरूपं, तत् तस्य तत्त्वं। यदन्यापेक्षं, न तत् तत्त्वं—अन्याभावेऽभावात्।[1] तस्मात् स्वाभाविकत्वात्...सुषुप्ते न विशेषः" (तै० भा०, २।८)। (*Vide* also केन० वाक्य-भा०, 1.4).

Sankara's elaborate discussions in his वेदान्त-भाष्य (II. 1. 14—20) on the relation between the cause and its effects bring into prominence these important truths. कारण or the *nature* of the individual things or beings maintains its identity and continues to live in its successive effects brought about by the action of the external stimulus (कारक-व्यापार)। These effects or states and activities do not touch or affect the nature of the cause. "अवस्थात्रयसाक्षी एकः अव्यभिचारी अवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृश्यते" (वे० भा०, २।१।९) ।—इत्यादि ।

These changing states and activities cannot, Sankara is careful to observe, constitute the *nature* of things. For, these are transient and always changing; but the underlying nature is not liable to change.[2]

Among other arguments used by Sankara to prove this 'nature,' the following may be specially noted here : Sankara

[1] In the Gita, Sankara employs similar arguments and has used the term सत् for स्वरूप and असत् for the changing states. "यद्विषया बुद्धि र्न व्यभिचरति ;तत् 'सत्'। यद्विषया व्यभिचरति तत्—'असत्'"—इत्यादि (गी०, २।१६)।

[2] "स्वभावश्चेत् क्रिया स्यात्, अनिर्मोक्षतैव स्यात्, न तु स्वभावः अतो विमोक्ष उपपद्यते" (बृ० भा०, ४।३।१५)। "न च स्वाभाविको धर्म्मो एव नास्ति पदार्थानां इति शक्यं वक्तुं...नित्यं।" "नहि क्रियानिर्वृत्तः अर्थः नित्यो दृष्टः"—इत्यादि, ४।४।६। The 'changes' have no स्वरूप or 'nature'—"स्वरूपेण अनुपाख्यत्वात्, दृष्टनष्टस्वरूपत्वात्" (वे० भा०, . . 14).

points out that every individual object, every individual self, exists *for itself*, as well as *for others* (स्वरूप and सम्बन्धि-रूप) । In other words, each individual has a substantive and an adjectival existence. The one, Sankara observes, cannot be reduced into the other. But an individual, in order to exist for others, must first of all exist for itself. If an individual does not exist for itself, has no *nature* of its own, how can it come into *relation* with others and how can others elicit from it its states and activities ? You cannot say that finite individuals exist only by refernce to something beyond them. Things cannot be merely adjectival to one another. The same identical देवदत्त comes to be designated differently in relation to different objects with which he comes into connection, but *Devadatta* does not, says Sankara, lose his own nature,—does not abandon his identity, when he is thus designated differently.—

"एकस्यापि स्वरूप-वाह्यरूपापेक्षया अनेकशब्दप्रत्ययदर्शनात्। एकोपि सन् देवदत्तः स्वरूपं सम्बन्धिरूपञ्च अपेक्ष्य अनेकशब्दप्रत्ययभाक् भवति"—इत्यादि (वे० भा० २।२।१७) ।

Making his position thus clear, Sankara now goes on to argue that the *nature* of the individual cannot be resolved into its states and activities, inasmuch as the *nature* maintains its identity and continuity in its changing and successive states and activities. He observes that " an individual, simply because a new difference has emerged,—certain particular states and activities are produced in it,—does not lose his own character and becomes something else." "न हि विशेषदर्शनमात्रेण वस्त्वन्यत्वं भवति...स एवेति प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्" (वे० भा०, २।१।१८) । Elsewhere he teaches that "you will never meet with any particular successive states which are not interwoven in, and sustained by, the underlying continuity of their real *nature*"—"सामान्याननुविद्धानां विशेषाणामदर्शनात्" (बृ० भा०) । Yet such is the perversity of the ordinary human mind that it forgets or ignores the presence of the true self which underlies

its successive states and takes the self to consist entirely of its mutually exclusive states and activities connected by a mechanical causal law. Sankara says that this is done by the influence of *Avidya* or our natural ignorance. The *aggregate* of these states and activities is the empirical self of the ordinary ignorant people, and this is the only self to them. This is stated by Sankara as the कर्तृत्व-भोक्तृत्वविशिष्ट जीव। The *nature* or the underlying स्वरूप of the individuals, as we have shown above, is the *real* self and it is कूटस्थ or Transcendental. It is *free* in its activities, because it is *above* time and it has no antecedent in time to determine its actions. This agency is the true agency in the system of Sankara. Out of its own resources which are inexhaustible, this real self can introduce an entirely new element in time and it can chalk out a new path for itself and initiate a new movement. Its vision is kept confined to its future infinite possibilities and it is moving on and on in the direction of its Divine goal, for which reason it is called by Sankara as अग्रात्मक। Wherever Sankara denies *agency* to the self, it is always the *passive* agency (if such term can be used) of the empirical self, because all its manifested activities and states are, as shown above, mechanically determined in an unbroken series in time. Sankara never denies anywhere the free active agency of the underlying real self.[1]

We shall now proceed to show more particularly that Sankara, too, regarded the real self as an *active power* and "its activity is reflected in all our sensitive, ideational and in all other aspects of our experience."

The following discussion will bring out the two-fold sense, in Sankara's system, in which the term agency has been used and will, we also hope, bring into prominence

[1] Sankara denies *movement or change* to the Real Self. He calls such activity a चलनात्मक, .e., in which the organs, *manas*, etc., etc., actually *move*. Such activity he keepss confined to the Empirical Self. "चलनात्मकस्य कर्मण: चलनात्मकत्वं कस्य चर्च करोतीति प्रवृत्ति-दर्शनात्" (गी०, १८।१६)।

the fact that the Pure Ego is an active power when it gains the *perception* of the external world.

(3) Sankara describes—"Whenever *any* of our organs functions, there are always two kinds of *activities* simultaneously present there. Of these, the one is visible and the other invisible ; one is transitory and dependent, and the other is permanent and independent ; the one works in time, the other is beyond time. There are *two visions* (द्वे दृष्टी—दृष्टिरिति द्विविधा भवति, लौकिकी पारमार्थिकी च)। The first kind is an activity evoked in the mind through the affection of the organ of eye. This activity is transitory in its character ; it appears, it disappears. It is a change produced when the eye is stimulated into activity by an external object with which it has come into contact ; and it vanishes when that contact ceases to operate. But underlying this activity here, there is an eternal and permanent vision of the self and this vision or activity constitutes its real nature, as heat and light constitute the nature of the fire. This vision of the self cannot be said to be produced, neither can it be said to be liable to disappear. The former vision of the eye, as soon as it is produced, is found to be invariably *permeated or pervaded* by the latter vision or the permanent activity of the self which is constantly present and operative behind it.[1] Thus the two kinds of vision or activity appear *blended* together and the ignorant, unable to discriminate one from the other, are liable to misrepresent the activity of the self as actually produced and as actually disappearing, with the appearance and disappearance of the changing activity of the eye. Hence, although the activity of the self is eternal and unchanging, it is held to be seeing when the vision of the eye is excited, and to be not seeing when the vision vanishes. This is also the case with the functions of the other organs of sense" (बृ० भा०, III. 4. 2 and ऐ० भा०, II. 1.).

[1] "लौकिक्या दृष्टेः कर्मभूतायाः द्रष्टारं स्वकीयया नित्यया दृष्ट्या व्याप्तारं न पश्येः?"—बृह० भा०, ३।४।२।

Now what do these remarks show? They unmistakably bring to light the important fact that in the perception of the external objects what really perceives is the self and that it is this self which exhibits its real *agentship* (कर्त्तृत्व) in its activities of comparison, discrimination and assimilation. Sankara holds that there can be no perception of a definite object unless there is an active comparison of similars and dissimilars "निष्कृष्य समानासमानजातीयेभ्यः...इदंतत्—इति निर्द्दिश्यते" (तै० भा०, २।६)। In the Brihadaranyaka and in the Vedanta Bhasya also, Sankara thus briefly describes the activity of the underlying self in the act of perception :—"I happen to receive two distinct kinds of sense-impressions when somebody touches me by his leg and next by his hand. There is as yet no discrimination, until the self energetically sets to work to compare one kind of sensation with another and differentiate one from dissimilar other sensations received by me in the past and to assimilate the one to similar other sensations. These activities of comparison, reflection, discrimination and assimilation are all operations of our बुद्धि which is a mere *instrument* in the hands of the self; for all these activities are indeed my present changes, but these activities *discover* the active self as the subject from whom they issue. An activity which distinguishes, an activity which carries the work of comparison and raises the sense-presentations to the level of *discriminative* consciousness cannot be a mere item of passive feelings. By these activities the Ego is *discovered* as the energetic *source* from which the actions isssue. "त्वङ्मात्रेन कुतो विवेक-प्रतिपत्तिः?" Then again, so long as the self does not direct its *attention* to the changes recieved, they can never become the *objects* of our knowledge. It is for this that Sankara remarks—"अन्यत्रमना अभूवं नापश्यम्", etc., etc. All these *reveal* the presence and operation of an *active* self underlying these feelings and activities, which maintains its identity in its constant movement a mong similar and dissimilar elements, and to which both the past and

the present belong. We find Sankara remarking—"न हि अन्यदृष्टः अन्यः स्मरति प्रतिसन्धाति वा"। "तेनेदं सदृशं—तेनेति दृष्ट-स्मरणं—ईति द्वयायत्तत्वात् सादृश्यस्य...सदृशयो र्द्वयो र्वस्तुनोः ग्रहीतुरेकस्य अभावात् सादृश्यनिमित्तं प्रतिसन्धानमिति मिथ्याप्रलाप एव स्यात्" (वे० भा०, २।२।२५).

The *identity* of the self which persists through its changing states is implied in any exercise of memory; "to know a flower by scent we must remember a prior experience of it and discriminate it from other appeals to the same sense".

"अहमदोऽद्राक्षं, इदं पश्यामीति च, पूर्व्वोत्तरदर्शिनि एकस्मिन्नसति कथं प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रत्ययः स्यात्?"

These observations prove that to Sankara, the real character of the Pure Ego is not merely "a being", or "a knowledge",—but an "active power" and a *source* of activities. And this source cannot be phenomenalised, for in its absence there would be no perception at all. In connection with this subject, we crave our reader's indulgence for the liberty of quoting a few other passages bearing on this important point.

(4) In the *Gita* (Chap. XIII, 12-13), Brahma's nature is described as neither *sat*, nor *asat*,—apparently possessing no definite characteristics. Now, the question arises—is *Atma* to be regarded, then as a mere non-entity, a non-existent something? For, if there is no positive mark to characterise its nature, it is as good as a non-existent असत्. Now, we invite our reader's attention to the reply which Sankara suggests to this very pertinent question :—

No, you cannot say that *Atma* is non-existent or असत्. For, there are *indicative marks* by the help of which we are enabled to infer,—we are assured of—His nature. What are these indications? To prevent the supposition that आत्मा must be a mere void or non-entity (शून्य)—गीता proceeds to teach that "the *Atma* exists as (1) the inner self (प्रत्यगात्मा)

and as (2) the *source* of *all activities* of the senses and the like." Sankara points out that "Krishna proves, by way of inference, the existence of आत्मा as the inner-self thus:—There must be a self-conscious principle (power) behind the insentient elements *in activity*, such as physical body and the senses; for, we invariably find self-conscious principle underlying all insentient objects *in activity*, such as carriage in motion. Hands, feet and the like, constituting the limbs of all bodies in all places, *derive their activity* from the *Energy inherent* in the Knowable (आत्मा) and as such, they are the marks of its existence and operation."[1] Sankara also says that "आत्मा reveals its nature through the *Upádhis* of external and internal senses, through the *functions* of all the senses, *viz.*, determination, thoughts, purposes, hearing, speech, etc., etc., *i.e.*, the Knowable *functions as it were* through the functions of all the senses. But does it *actually* function? The *Sruti* implies the Knowable has the power to accommodate itself to the varying functions of all the senses......not that it *actually possesses* swift motion and such other activities". This is shown by Sankara elsewhere by his remarks—"सत्तामात्र एव कर्त्तृत्वं, न तु व्यापृततया". It does not imply that the self is to be regarded as merely '*a being*'. It does not mean that the self is not a *power*. It simply implies that this power cannot be phenomenalised or reduced into its manifested activities. This expression has been chosen to guard against the supposition that the self is subject or liable to transient changes or विकारs, and to show that it is a निर्व्विकार power. This power is constantly *present* and *operative* behind the activities, as their free active *source* or *seat*,—of which these are but partial manifestations and these manifestations can never exhaust this inexhaustible source. These manifested

[1] What is the *source* of these *activities* must *itself* be an *active Power*. Sankara calls it "प्रयोक्ता" in केन० भा०, "संहतानां श्रोत्रादीनां परार्थत्वाद्वगम्यते श्रोत्रादीनां प्रयोक्ता".

activities are the indicative marks of their underlying power. In the Chandogya-bhasya, the *nature* of the self is actually called "सामर्थ्यं" or the source of power (8.12.4). And it is characterised as—"करण-व्यापारेषु अव्यापृतः, तद्विलक्षणः" (Gita, XIII. 22), *i.e.*, this *source* cannot be resolved into the activities of the senses and the like, but is present and operative in and through them and above them. This important truth is expressed in the Vedanta-Bhasya by the expression "न कारणस्य कार्य्यात्मत्वं", that is to say, the underlying power (cause) cannot be reduced to and identified with its manifested activities (effects), because this *source* is inexhaustible and as such, no one of its manifestations can fix it in a rigid form and be regarded as final. It is the influence of *avidya* alone which, as Sankara tells us, is responsible for this erroneous identification. If the cause cannot be resolved into, or identified with, its effects ; if the true *nature* of the individual self maintains its identity through its successive changes ; if it is by *avidya* that we confound the underlying unity with its multiple states and activities ;—it follows, as night follows the day, that all activities which we find in the phenomena must be traced to their underlying self or the unity as their *source*. Had Sankara reduced, like the Pantheists, the causal Reality into its successive activities and states, then of course for the source of these activities we must seek the phenomena alone. But Sankara has repeatedly remarked that when an individual being or a thing assumes different forms or phases in consequence of its connections with the things outside it, it does not lose its identity—it does not become something else entirely different from its own nature "न हि विशेषदर्शनमात्रेण वस्त्वन्यत्वं भवति......स एवेति प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्" (वे० भा०). It still maintains its unity, preserves its identical nature, in and through these successively changing phases or differences. We must therefore look for the *source* of all phenomenal activities, according to Sankara, to the *nature* of the individual thing or the self

which underlies these activities and continues to operate through them unaffected by them.

(5) As in the intellectual, so also in our moral experience, the operation of an active underlying self cannot be abolished. We here briefly describe Sankara's method in the choice of the Ends in our moral sphere. In the कठ-भाष्य, he thus explains—In Sankara's system, *Brahma* is both Transcendent and Immanent. If it be of purely transcendental nature, all possibility of comprehending Him would be shut out for man. He would be remote and abstract being. But fortunately, He is also immanent in nature and in man and through this revelation man can comprehend His nature to a certain extent. Man seeks the realisation of the End inherent in his nature. But if he seeks this end merely in the external mundane order, he will not find it there. "योहि वहिर्मुखः प्रवर्त्तते पुरुषः इष्टं मे भूयादनिष्टं मे माभूदिति, न च तत्रात्यन्तिकं पुरुषार्थं लभते" (के० भा०, १।१।४). For, the outward nature, as it is, cannot be regarded as complete and self-sufficient. The rational and ethical human being appears to be the goal of nature. Sankara teaches—"विषयस्यैव स्वात्मग्राहकत्वेन, स्वात्मप्रकाशनाय, संस्थानान्तरं करणं नाम" (बृ० भा०, २।४।११). The outward nature has supplied man with his senses and nervous system, by which he is put into relation with the world. The more his organs and his mind are developed, he is able more and more to realise the grandeur of the universe. He must therefore seek his End within his own nature. The infinite Divine ज्ञानैश्वर्य is revealed in man and we are endowed with capacity to realise it. But if man seeks the ज्ञानैश्वर्य as it is found *actually* present in human beings and regards this as the final end, he will be disappointed. For, the indwelling ज्ञानैश्वर्य-शक्ति-सौन्दर्य is also transcendental and it therefore cannot be *identified* with the actual ज्ञानैश्वर्य as is working in human beings. He must therefore seek the अनन्त शक्तिसौन्दर्य in the future possibilities (ends) of man. It is progressively

revealing its nature in man and will reach perfection in future.

"Two Ends", Sankara writes,—"one mundane, the other transcendental—come to man indiscriminately for his choice. All men are propelled by these two goods, according as one wishes for mundane prosperity, or the supreme happiness. These two are opposed and conflicting in their nature to each other. It is therefore impossible for the two goods to be pursued by the same individual at the same moment. Among these, one who pursues the mundane good and regards this as the true end of this life, misses the true end of man. These two are not easily distinguishable by persons of poor intelligence and of irresolute mind. The truly wise man examines both the pleasant and the good—the mundane and supra-mundane ends—as a flamingo separates milk and water, and having considered in his mind the relative weight of the two courses, divides them both and selects only the Supreme end as preferable to the mundane ends. But the man of poor intelligence, incapable of such discrimination, pursues the lower good, such as cattle, sons, wealth, position, etc., for the purpose of gratifying their pleasures of sense" (काठ-भाष्य).

Here again, the discrimination between the higher and lower goods, comparison of the relative worth of the two courses, the rejection of the one and the selection of the other and pursuing of the same until the supreme end is perfectly realised—all these activities distinctly reveal the presence and operation of an energetic self, not as a "mere being," or a "mere knowledge", but as an active Power. In spite of such clear expression of his views, is it not doing a great injustice to Sankara's system to hold that Sankara's pure Ego is not a "persistent activity"? We shall further speak on this supreme End later on.

(6) Plants and trees are looked upon in the school of Sankara as a kind of lower *organisms*. This school admits

the existence and evolution of 4 kinds of organism, *viz.*, स्वेदज, अण्डज, उद्भिज्ज and जरायुज. Now, within even the organism of the plants, there is, says Sankara, the constant operation of an active self and its power is to be inferred from the incessant movement of the sap (रस) within the body of the plants, and from the gradual growth and development of the plant through its successive stages till the full development of the tree is reached.[1] Sankara in his commentary on the छान्दोग्य उपनिषद् and in other places distinctly expressed his views as to the impossibility of regarding any of the stages of the plant-development as *separate* and self-sufficient (अन्य) from the process of development of the plant as a whole. The अङ्कुरावस्था is seen to arise after the destruction or disappearance of its antecedent condition, *viz.*, the बीजावस्था; but that does not, Sankara tells us, prove that असत् or non-existence is the cause of the अङ्कुर. The *future possibility* of the tree which is the final *end* [2] is present in its बीज-stage and other subsequent stages and this it is which is the *real cause* which has successively operated in bringing the plant to its final stage or full development. In the ब्रह्म° भाष्य, १।२।१, he explains his theory of causality with the help of the illustration of मृत्तिका and its successive developments into the final घट. This is to be regarded as a typical illustration which holds good in all cases of causal development in the light of the rules given in the ब्रह्म-सूत्र, II. 1. 14-20. "स्वेन भविष्यद्रूपेण घटो विद्यते"। "घटस्य प्रागभाव इति—न घटस्वरूपमेव प्रागुत्पत्ते र्नास्तीति"। In this way, the *end* is present in its cause from the very beginning and it is this end which gradually carries the real

[1] "जीवेन च प्राणयुक्तेन अशितं पीतं च रसतां गतं, जीवच्छरीरं वृक्षं च वर्द्धयत् रसरूपेण—जीवस्य सद्भावे लिङ्गं भवति।...वृक्षस्य रसस्रवणशोषणादिलिङ्गात् जीववत्त्वं...चेतनावन्तः स्थावराः"—छा० भा०, ६।११।२।

[2] That it is present as a *future end* has been expressed by Sankara in the phrase—"अनागतार्थिप्रवृत्तेश्च" (बृह० भा०, १।२।१)। अर्थ (*artha*) is the End towards which the अर्थी (*i.e.*; the causal substance मृत्तिका in the illustration here) strives. For, the potter for the purpose of constructing घट, gave मृत्तिका its successive shapes.

nature of the cause through its successive stages, until it is fully realised in the last stage. He says—"असति पर्थितया प्रवृत्ति र्न दृष्टा". To realise this purpose or the end, the movement of the causal substance had begun in the past, and this continues in the present until it reaches its final realisation in future.[1] If we keep this teaching before our view, we shall be able to comprehend the real significance of the fact as to why in Sankara's system the effect or the end is stated to be अनन्य from its cause. To understand the true nature of the cause, we must see it realised successively through all its stages of manifestation up till the final stage, and no one of its stages can, therefore, be *separated* from it and regarded as something अन्य. (*Vide* the last page also.)

(7) In the *human* organism also in the similar manner, it is the self as an active power which, for the realisation of its *purpose* inherent in it (पारार्थ्येन निमित्तभूतेन), has built up the body. It has brought into being certain elements within it and combined and organised them in such a way that one and all co-operate to realise a common purpose. " ऐन्द्रियिकाश्चेष्टाः संहतैः कार्य्यकरणै र्निर्व्वर्त्यमाना दृश्यन्ते। तच्च एकार्थवृत्तित्वेन संहननं, नान्तरेण चेतन मसंहतं सम्भवति" (तै, भा, २।७). In the कठ भाष्य, similar observations are found. "......'स्वार्थेन' असंहतेन परेण केनचिदप्रयुक्तं संहतानां (*i.e.* 'परार्थानां') अवस्थानं न दृष्टं, यस्य असंहतस्य 'अर्थे' प्राणापानादिः सर्व्वं व्यापारं कुर्व्वन् वर्त्तते, संहतः सन्, स ततो ऽन्यः" (५।५).[2] That is to say—the self which is स्वार्थ (self-existing and self-working and having the 'reason' or 'purpose' of its being in itself) and which is अन्य (*i.e.* which transcends) from these elements has combined them with a view

[1] "यथा कारणं त्रिषु कालेषु सत्त्वं न व्यभिचरति, तथा कार्य्यमपि जगत् त्रिषु कालेषु सत्त्वं न व्यभिचरति ; एकञ्च पुनः सत्त्व"—वे० भा०, २।१।१६ ॥

[2] The terms स्वार्थ and परार्थ have been explained before in this paper. Sankara has laid down this as a *general rule* that wherever there is combination and combined activity, there must be an underlying power which has combined the elements for the realisation of *its purpose*. स्वार्थेन असंहतेन परेण केनचित् अप्रयुक्तं संहतानामवस्थानं न दृष्टं" (कठ० भाष्य).

to realise its own purpose through them and thus the organism has been built up. The elements and the senses (and their activities) are परार्थ, because these are the means or medii or mere instruments through which the purpose of the self is realised. "देहेन्द्रियादीनां यत् स्वरूपधारणं चैतन्यात्मपारार्थ्येन निमित्तभूतेन तत् आत्मकृतमेव" (गीता-भा, १३।२२)। पारार्थ्य is the निमित्त here, *i.e*, the realisation of its final end is the निमित्त or the impelling occasion and the building up of the body and its successive development are आत्मकृत, *i.e.*, are brought about by the *agentship* of the self. Can a clearer exposition of the theory go further? That the self is an *active power* is thus everywhere shown by Sankara.

(8) In the Vedanta-sutras and in the Upanishads, *Brahma* is described as प्राणस्य प्राणः. That is to say that Brahma is the underlying Power of Prána.—He is the controlling and directing Power which underlies प्राणशक्ति. This प्राणशक्ति in Sankara's system is held to be the first manifestation of ब्रह्म's nature. Held by the underlying Power and sustained by it, this *Prána* has differentiated itself into the form of the objects of the world and this differentiation is always going on. *Brahma* in Sankara's system is not a characterless Being; He has a distinct *nature*, a 'selfhood', a character, a स्वरूप, स्वभाव of his own, and this 'nature' underlies the differentiations of प्राणशक्ति, *untouched* and *unaffected* by them. "नामरूपाभ्यामस्पृष्टं", "नामरूपाभ्यामन्यः", "नामरूपाभ्यां विलक्षणं...तथापि तयोर्निर्वोढ़"—all these refer to the truth. As *Brahma* is both a transcendental and immanental principle, he is revealed in the world as the differentiations of *Prána*, but still he is not *identified* with them, but maintains his unity or his nature in them. This has been beautifully expressed in a passage in the ईशा॰ भाष्य. "Held and sustained by the underlying ब्रह्म—a चेतन-Power,—the प्राण has differentiated itself—externally as the activities of heat, light, etc., exhibited by the objects sun, fire, etc., and internally

as the physical and mental activities of the sentient beings."[1] Elsewhere, the underlying principle of Prána is called अन्तर्यामी—*i.e.*, sustaining *Power* which controls and directs the प्राणशक्ति and its differentiations.[2]

It is very difficult to understand how the learned writer could think of bringing the charge of Pantheism upon Sankara. In various places of his commentary—both on the Vedanta-sutras and on the Upanishads, Sankara has criticised the theory of Pantheism held by one Vrittikára, and his entire theory is a monumental refutation of that Pantheism. वृत्तिकार reduced the unity entirely into the differentiations (नाम-रूप). Sankara argues that when the differences emerge, the underlying unity is not reduced into them. The unity has not, as the नाम रूप arises—as the differentiations emerge—become something else losing its own nature. "न हि विशेषदर्शनमात्रेण वस्त्वन्यत्वं भवति···स एवेति प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्." It retains its unity, its own character, behind these differences, changes. In criticising वृत्तिकार's view, he shows that when unity is entirely reduced to multiplicity, the former cannot retain its *distinct* character; for it is now to be found present in the form of many. Hence, he argues, both the unity and multiplicity cannot be held to be real in this view. If *one* is real, *many* must be false; and if many is real, the unity must be false. (*Vide* the whole criticism in बृ॰ भा॰, 5.1.1.) But in Sankara's own theory, no such faults vitiate it. The underlying unity is real and it retains its distinct 'nature' *in* the differences which emerge. The differences are the *stages*, in and through which, that nature is gradually realising itself. The changes or differences are not therefore

[1] "तस्मिन्नात्मतत्त्वे नित्यचैतन्यस्वभावे (स्वयमविक्रियमेव सत्), मातरिश्वा...यदाश्रयाणि कार्य्यकरण-जातानि...यत् सूत्रसंज्ञकं...प्राणिनां चेष्टालक्षणानि, अग्न्यादित्यपर्ज्जन्यादीनां ज्वलनदहनाभिवर्षणादिलक्षणानि ···विभजति। सर्व्वा हि कार्य्यकरणविक्रिया नित्यचैतन्यात्मस्वरूपे सर्व्वास्पदभूते सत्येव भवन्ति।"

[2] "निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तमेकमद्वयं...सर्व्वसाधारणाव्याकृत-जगद्बीज-'प्रवर्त्तक' नियन्तृत्वात् अन्तर्यामि-संज्ञं भवति।" ऐ° भा°, ३.२ "तत्कृतं हि प्राणस्य प्राणन-सामर्थ्यं—केन° भा°, १।२ :

something *different* from it, for they cannot be *separated* from it and regarded as if they are *independent*, existing on their own account (नहि 'वस्तुवृत्तेन' विकारोनाम कश्चिदस्ति"—वे॰ भा॰, 2.1.4). It is in this way, remarks Sankara in the *Chandogya Bhasya*, that the *Naiyayikas* look upon the changes—each complete in itself—as if they are *separated* from one another by blank intervals.[1] But it is not proper, Sankara observes, to regard the changes or differences which emerge, in this way. The changes are all interwoven into the underlying unity which realises itself in them. "सामान्यं हि विशेषान् आत्मस्वरूपप्रदानेन बिभर्त्ति...सामान्यानानुविद्धानां विशेषाणाम-दर्शनात्"—बृ॰ भा॰, 1.5.1, and 2.1.11. Each change or विशेष is 'woven' in the सामान्य which pervades them all and works in them all ("चैतन्याव्यतिरेकेणैव कला जायमाना लिङ्गस्य: सर्व्वदा लक्ष्यन्ते"—प्र॰ भा॰). The underlying cause is revealing itself—is making itself *to be*—in the successive changes. Sankara's other remarks on this point are of supreme importance and we desire to briefly state them here. The changes, he says, which will appear in future stages—the changes that are *to be* are not unreal or असत्. They *exist* in the cause as *future ends*—स्वेन भविष्यद्रूपेण घटोवर्त्तते (बृ॰ भा॰ 1.2.1). The change is a *relation* between two terms. In order to be related, the two terms of the relation must be *real*. The change is therefore a relation between something present and something future, *i.e.*, which is going *to be*. If you say the future is unreal—is nothing, then the cause or ब्रह्म would itself become unreal.[2] The future (घट) therefore operates in the present (*i.e.*, in मृत्तिका), and the present becomes thus

[1] "यथा सतोऽन्यवस्त्वन्तरं परिकल्प्य, पुनस्तस्यैव प्रागुत्पत्तेः असत्त्वं प्रध्वंसाच्च ऊर्द्धं असत्त्वं ब्रुवते-तार्किकाः, न तथा अस्माभिः," etc., etc., etc., छा॰ भा॰ 6.2.2.

[2] In माण्डूक्य॰, 6, Sankara says—"यदि हि असतामेव जन्म स्यात्, ब्रह्मणो ग्रहणद्वाराभावात् असत्त्व-प्रसङ्गः." आनन्दगिरि elaborates this passage thus—"ग्रहायत्तत्वात् सम्बन्धस्य। तदेवसद्भवेत्, —न तेन कार्य्येण कारणसम्बन्धधीरिति असदेव कारणमपि स्यात्." Sankara also says—"कार्य्येण हि लिङ्गेन कारणब्रह्मज्ञानार्थत्वं सृष्टिश्रुतीनां, अन्यथा ग्रहणद्वाराभावात्, असदेव कारणमपि स्यात्."
Here compare also—"अपि महता यदस्ति, तदात्मना विनिर्म्मुक्तं 'असत्' भवति" (कठ, 2.20).

connected with the future. Hence the cause is really the future end or power which is realising itself in all the changes. It is therefore this power which underlies and works in all changes. It gives continuity to them and is *above* them all. It is realising itself through all successive changes which cannot therefore be *separated* from it.[1] Sankara beautifully illustrates this idea thus—"As a player, taking on successive characters upon himself, enacts on the stage the parts of each of these characters in succession, but yet retains his *own distinct* character, so the underlying causal unity, retaining its own distinct identity, realises itself successively in each of the changes produced."[2] In the face of such a theory which has been so clearly explained, we fail to understand how Sankara's *Brahma* could be represented as a "pantheistic void" and how also the finite individuals who have a distinct *nature* of their own could be made to be "absorbed in this void." Sankara has clearly shown (in बृ० भा० 2.1.20 and in वेदा०, 4.3.14, etc.) that the individual selves cannot be mere *parts* (अवयव) of an all-inclusive *whole*, for in that case the whole, *i.e.*, ब्रह्म would be affected by the pleasure, pain and other experiences of the parts, and the finite individuals will have to lose their own स्वरूपs, and *Brahma* itself will have to come down here to become a mundane *Jiva*.[3]

[1] Sankara notes that as cause itself holds all its evolved successive changes विशेषs by its own power (स्वरूप) and realises itself in each of them, how can the changes be separated from things? सामान्यं आत्मस्वरूप-प्रदानेन विशेषान् बिभर्त्ति and सामान्ये तत्स्वतत्त्वकानामिव धर्म्माणां स्पष्टीकरणं विशेषाणां (बृह° & का° भाष्य).

[2] "मूलकारणमेव आ-अन्त्यात् कार्य्यात्, तेन तेन कार्य्याकारेण, नटवत्, सर्व्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते" (वेदा° भा°, २।१।१८)। "The underlying causal power is *distinct* from its effects, but the effects are not distinct and separate from the cause." कार्य्यस्य कारणात्मत्वं, न तु कारणस्य कार्य्यात्मत्वं (वे°).

[3] "अथ अनेकद्रव्यसमाहारस्य सावयवस्य ब्रह्मणः एकदेशविपरिणामी विज्ञानात्मा...अथ नित्यायुत-सिद्धावयवानुगतोऽवयवी पर आत्मा, तस्यैव एकदेशो विज्ञानात्मा संसरति,—तदापि सर्व्वावयवानुगतत्वात् अवयविन एव अवयवगतो दोषो गुणो वेति...विज्ञानात्मनः दोषेण परमात्मा सम्बध्यते—इयमपि अनिष्टा कल्पना", etc., etc., etc., (बृह० भा०, 2.1.20).

That neither *Brahma*, nor the individual Pure self is mere *abstraction*, the following criticism by Sankara of the Pantheistic view held by *Vrittikára* will conclusively prove. Sankara thus criticises the view:—"If 'one' is changed to 'many,' *both* cannot be real. But as you hold both of them to be real, there is mutual contradiction—there is विरुद्धधर्मसमवायित्वं—एकस्यैवात्मनः अशनायाद्यतीतत्वं तद्वत्त्वञ्च (बृ०, 3.5.1). That is to say, one and the same self cannot be regarded as possessed of qualities (many) and also devoid of all qualities (one).[1] Yet such absurd supposition would be the irresistible consequence of your theory—you who regard *both* to be real. But this absurdity does not touch our position, since the 'unity' we regard to be of one type and 'many' to be of a different type.[2]

Then Sankara goes on to expose another absurdity of his opponent's pantheism. He points out—'If 'one' is changed to 'many,' then everything would be equally divine and equally perfect. There would be no distinction between *Brahma* and nature. Hence 'many' must prove to be unreal, since there is only one reality. But in our case, 'many' is not *unreal*.[3] Because these qualities (many) are

[1] "विधिप्रशक्तिमस्त्वप्रदर्शनं, विशेषप्रतिषेधश्च—इति विप्रतिषिद्धं" (गो० भा०, 13-12).

"ननु अनेकात्मकं ब्रह्म...यथा समुद्रात्मना एकत्वं, फेनतरङ्गाद्यात्मना नानात्वं; अतः एकत्वं नानात्वञ्च—उभयमपि सत्यमेव?...नैवं स्यात्" (वे० भा०, 114.

[2] "न मयेदमेकात्मन् धर्म्मिणि अभिहितं। त्वयैव इदं विरुद्धधर्मत्वेन एकं वस्तु परिगृहीतं भ्रान्त्या; न तु मयोक्तं" (बृह० भा०, 2.4.13). Sankara's reply is—The self is not really changed into states or qualities. The states are elicited by the interaction of the self with the environment. The underlying real self maintains its unity in these states. Hence self is *distinct* from its states and has a 'nature' of its own.

[3] This is the renowned *Sat-Káryya-váda* (सत्कार्य्यवाद) of the Vedanta Philosophy. The effects or the changes produced—reveal the nature of the cause. Sankara remarks in माण्डुक्य भाष्य that it is the manifestations which throw light on that which is manifested. The nature of the underlying Reality is to be read in the manifestations. If therefore what is revealed is taken to be *unreal*—non-existent—then it can come into no *relation* with the underlying Reality. For, to be related there must be two terms which are *both real*. Otherwise, the causal reality would, as *Ânandagiri* explains the idea, itself prove to be unreal and thus Brahma would be an unreality. "कार्य्यं च हि लिङ्गेन कारण-ब्रह्म-ज्ञानार्थत्वं स्वीक्रियतोऽस्ति। तच्चेदसद् भवेत्, न तेन कारणस्य सम्बन्धोऽस्तीति असदपि कारणमपि स्यात्"।

the manifestations of the underlying 'nature' of the self and these gradually reveal this nature. When erroneously *separated* from the self, they become unreal; but under no circumstances can these changes or differences remain *separated* from the self; because the self realises itself gradually through them." This is how Sankara expresses this important fact—

(*a*) "The differentiations existing in the underlying self (ब्रह्म) unfold in all situations, without abandoning the nature of the self and without being *separated* or divided from Brahma, either in space or in time." [1]

(*b*) "All differentiations or states are produced from the self without being *separated* from it and they appear being permeated by it." [2]

(*c*) "All created beings—moveables and immoveables—have their *source* in Brahma; during their continuance also, they exist or live in Brahma—as *apart from* the clay the jar has no existence." [3]

(*d*) "A product is seen to arise from its underlying cause *not separated* or divided from it." [4]

Such in fact is the criticism which runs in various parts of his commentaries by which Sankara deals a death-blow to the giant of Pantheism. Can a man, we submit, who has taken particular care to show that the created and emerging

"सतो हि द्वयोः सम्बन्धः, न सदसतो रसतो वा". Hence the future effect (end) *exists* in the cause. In the theory of Sankara therefore—'one' is not *reduced* into 'many', but one *contains* many which cannot be *separated* from it. 'Many' is merely its revelations and hence it is अनन्य from the one, *i.e.*, incorporated (अनुविद्ध) as its elements in the 'one.'

[1] "यदा आत्मस्थे नामरूपे व्याक्रियेते, तदा नामरूपे आत्मस्वरूपापरित्यागेनैव ब्रह्मणा अप्रविभक्तदेशकाले सर्व्वावस्थासु व्याक्रियेते" (तै० भा०, २।६)।

[2] "चैतन्याव्यतिरेकेणैव हि कलाः जायमानाः तिष्ठन्त्यः प्रलीयमानाश्च सर्व्वदा लक्ष्यन्ते" (प्र० भा०, ६।२)।

[3] "स्थावरजङ्गमलक्षणाः सर्व्वाः प्रजाः न केवलं सन्मूला एव, इदानीमपि स्थितिकाले सदायतना एव। न हि मृदमनाश्रित्य घटादेः स्थितिः सत्त्वं वा अस्ति" (छा० भा०, ६।८।४)।

[4] "यस्य च यस्मादात्मलाभः स तेन अप्रविभक्तो दृष्टः, यथा घटादीनां मृदा" (बृ० भा०, १।६।१)।

changes can never be *separated* from their underlying cause and the underlying cause also can never be *resolved* into these changes,—look upon the underlying *Brahma* or the individual self as a *mere abstraction* ?

Sankara is a great name in the philosophical literature of India, and perhaps the greatest. But unfortunately great injustice has been done to him both here and in Europe. The present paper will show how he has been misunderstood in respect of a most vital point.[1]

---

[1] The reader is requested to consult our work " *Introduction to Adwaita Philosophy* " published by the Calcutta University, Second Edition, in which other points have been considered.

ON SOME PASSAGES OF THE HARṢACARITA OF BĀṆA.

BY

SITANATH PRADHĀN, M. SC.,

Demonstrator in Physics, Murarichand College, Sylhet.

In the sixth chapter, nineteenth paragraph, of Bāṇabhaṭṭa's Harṣacarita, there is a sentence which stands thus :

आश्चर्यकुतूहली च दण्डोपनतयवननिर्मितेन नभस्तलयायिना यन्त्रयानेना-
नीयत क्वापि काकवर्णः शैशुनागिर्नगरोपकण्ठे कण्ठश्चास्य निचकृते निस्त्रिंशेन ।

Messrs. Cowell and Thomas have translated the passage thus :[1]

"Kākavarṇa being curious of marvels was carried away no one knows whither on an artificial aerial car made by a Yavana condemned to death.

The son of Śiśunānga had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city."

So they have treated it as two separate sentences under the impression that Kākavarṇa and the son of Śiśunānga were two different persons. The Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition of 1897 [2] and the edition of Gajendragadkar (1919 ?) also divide the passage into two sentences introducing a word चण्डीपति which is not in any of Führer's manuscripts. Then again शैशुनागिः is the reading of all the editions. Messrs. Cowell and Thomas rightly take it to be शैशुनागि a reading which is found in three of Führer's manuscripts.[3]

[1] P. 193.

[2] P. 199.

[3] A, B. D., p. 269.

A reference to the original Sanskrit will make it clear that Skandagupta, the commandant of the elephant troops of Harṣa, was relating to his young master instances of disasters to Kings caused by their own follies giving one instance in each separate sentence.

Hence it is evident that Cowell and Thomas as well as all the editors have erred in treating Kākavarṇa and the son of Śiśunāga as different persons.

We are sure they had before them an edition of Harṣacarita which had the passage in question in the following wrong form :

आश्चर्यकुतूहली च दण्डोपनतयवननिर्मितेन नभस्तलयायिना यन्त्रयानेनानीयत क्वापि काकवर्णः। शैशुनागिश्च नगरोपकण्ठे कण्ठे निचकृते निस्त्रिंशेन।

This is the reading in Gajendragadkar's edition, and the Nirṇaya Sāgara edition has the full stop after क्वापि. That Kākavarṇa Śandaiśunāgi are one person will be evident from the Purāṇic list of kings of the Śiśunāga dynasty.[4]

Take again the next sentence which runs thus :

अतिस्त्रीसङ्गरतमनङ्गपरवशं शुङ्गममात्यो वसुदेवो देवभूमिं [तिं] दासीदुहित्रा देवीव्यञ्जनया वीतजीवितमकारयत्।

This passage has been translated as follows :

"In a frenzy of passion, the over-libidinous Śuṅga was, at the instance of his minister Vasudeva, reft of his life by a daughter of Devabhūti's slave woman disguised as his queen."

Devabhūti or Devabhumi was the last of the Śuṅga Kings, and was put to death by his minister Vasudeva of the Kāṇva family.

[4] Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 21-68,

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* : [5]

शुङ्गं हत्वा देवभूतिं काण्वोऽमात्यस्तु कामिनम्।
स्वयं करिष्यते राज्यं वसुदेवो महामतिः॥

And also the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* : [6]

देवभूतिं तु शुङ्गराजानं व्यसनिनं तस्यैवामात्यः काण्वो वसुदेव नामा निपात्य स्वयमवनीं भोक्ता।

It is a well-known fact to the historian that Devabhūti [°mi] Śuṅga was killed by Vasudeva Kāṇva and hence the reading देवभूतिं[°मिं] दासीदुहित्रा instead of the compound देवभूति [°मि] दासीदुहित्रा would be correct.

We have the following sentence again :

महाकालमहे च महामांसविक्रयवादवातूलं वेतालस्तालजङ्घो जघान जघन्यजं प्रद्योतस्य पौलिकं कुमारं कुमारसेनम्।

This passage refers to the King Prodyōta of the Prodyōta dynasty that was to a certain extent contemporary of the Śisunāga dynasty on the throne of Avanti. All the Purāṇas are unanimous in declaring that the last Bārhadratha King Ripuñjaya was murdered by his minister, who, after killing his master, placed his son Pradyōta on the throne. The name of this minister is variously given in the Purāṇas as we have them now.

Consulting Pargiter's *Purāṇa Text*, we see that

(1) Mss. of the *Vāyu Purāna* generally, and *l*, *h*, and *k* of *Viṣṇu* have it as सुनिक।

(2) Mss. of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* generally and *f* and *m* of *Vāyu* have it as शुनिक ; *f* of *Vāyu* have got शुनिक in one place and सुनिक in another.

[5] XII, 1. 18.
[6] IV, 24, 12 ; cf. also *Matsya*, 272, 32-33.

(3) *a* (*1-3*), *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *k*, *m*, *n* of *Matsya* have got it as पुलिक ; but *a* (*4*), *b*, *k*, *g*, *v*, *a*, *l* of *Matsya* have it as पुलक ; and *j* of *Matsya* has got it as पलिक in one place and पुलिक in another.

(4) *Bhāgavata* and *Brahmāṇḍa* have it as शुनक, while *d* of *Bhāgavata* has it as शनक. To determine the actual name of this minister of Ripuñjaya we proceed as follows :

(*a*) The last letter of the name is क as is attested for by all the Purāṇas unanimously.

(*b*) The second letter must be नि as is evidenced by the most authoritative Purāṇas, *Vāyu* and *Viṣṇu*, although the manuscripts of *Matsya* generally have it as लि. That this second letter should be नि gets an additional support from the most reliable of Führer's manuscripts (A, B) of *Harṣacarita* which spells the derivative (in the sense of a descendant) as पौलिक in the sentence quoted above. Just as the descendant of कुशिक is कौशिक (another name of Viśvāmitra) so the descendant of पुनिक is पौनिक.

Besides, we have the similar-sounding names, श्रेणिक and कूणिक, of kings, although of the neighbouring dynasty of Magadha, and शतानीक again of the dynasty of Kauśāmbī.

(*c*) As regards the first letter, *Vāyu* generally gives us सु, *Viṣṇu* generally reads सु, and the majority of *Matsya* manuscripts give us पु. Although *Vāyu* is the most authoritative Purāṇa, in many places the readings of names in it are corrupt owing to copyists' errors. *Viṣṇu* is the best in this respect, but not always. The reading पु of the first letter of the name in *Matsya* is supported by *Harṣacarita* where Bāṇa records the tradition handed down from mouth to mouth as is done in India even to our time in the form of folk-tales, *kathās*, etc. Hence there is less likelihood of the name as given by Bāṇa being corrupt. Bearing in mind again that Bāṇa was conversant with the *Vāyu Purāna* and recognising that his first letter agrees with that of *Matsya*, we think that the probability of the first letter of the name being पु is the

greatest. We hope our finding of the name will receive the general assent of all scholars.

Hence we conclude that the name of the father of Prodyōta was पुणिक and get from Harṣacarita the historical information that the king प्रद्योत of Avanti, who was also called Mahāsena the Violent (चण्ड महासेन), had a younger brother named Kumārasena [7], and that at this time human sacrifices were current, at least, in Ujjain on the occasion of the feast of Mahākāla, and that this Kumārasena was killed by the Vetāla (Vampire) when he (Kumārasena) was mad with anger at the news that human flesh was being sold.

Messrs. Cowell and Thomas rightly took the reading *Paunika* in the body of their translation, but in Appendix B they preferred the reading *Pauṇaki*, though Bühler's manuscript A gave the reading पौणिक which is correct, with only the ण changed for न.

Consider the passage in the seventh chapter of the book which runs thus :

अलसश्चक्षकोषो यो न प्राविक्षत् क्ष्मां जित्वा स्त्रीराज्यम्।

The author has spoken of kings like भगदत्त, दन्तवक्त्र, कर्ण, शिशुपाल etc., before and has remarked that all these kings of old were content with having small principalities. He goes to say that चक्षकोष, unlike these kings of old, subdued the whole earth ; still he must have been an idle man, as he did not enter "the Land of Women". His intention is to let us know that mighty deeds which could not be accomplished by these kings of old, will be done by his patron, the great Harṣavardhana Śilāditya of Thāṇesvar.

[7] To me it seems simpler to say that Kumārasena was the youngest son (*Jaghanyaja Kumāra*) of Pradyota by his wife Puṇikā. The reading Pauṇika is actually warranted by one manuscript.—D. R. Bhandarkar.

It struck us at once that this word चण्डकोष must be a corrupt reading of चण्डाशोक, another name of the great अशोकवर्धन प्रियदर्शी. Consulting Führer's manuscripts this belief was strengthened by the fact that although the majority have the reading चण्डकोष, the manuscripts A, B, and D have it as चण्डशोक.

Searching for स्त्रीराज्य, we find it mentioned in *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira where it is mentioned that स्त्रीराज्य lies to the north-west of India [8]:

दिशि पश्चिमोत्तरस्यां माण्डव्यतुषारतालहलमद्राः ।
अश्मककुलूतहलभाः स्त्रीराज्यनृसिंहवन खस्थाः ॥

It is remarked there by Varāhamihira that this geographical description was related before by Parāsara. Now Varāhamihira died in 587 A. C.[9] Thus the existence of "the Land of Women" in the sixth century and earlier is indicated.

In *Rājtaraṅgiṇī* [10] we find that King Jayāpīḍa surnamed Vinayāditya conquered "the Land of Women" about the eighth century :

चिरं जितवतस्तस्य स्त्रीराज्ये मण्डलं महत् ।
इन्द्रियग्राम विजयं बहुमन्यन्त भूभुजः ॥
कर्णश्री पटमाबध्य स्त्रीराज्याद्विनिर्जिताद् हृतम् ।
धर्माधिकरणाख्यं च कर्मस्थानं विनिर्ममे ॥

Hence *Strīrājya* existed till the end of the eighth century.

8 Part I, p, 291, Sudhākar Dvivedi's edition.
9 नवाधिकपञ्चशतसंख्यशकाके वराहमिहिराचार्यो दिवं गतः ।—R. G. Bhandarkar.
10 IV, 587-588.

In Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkacarita*[11] we notice that King Kalaśāditya (1063—1089) of Kāśmīr conquered "the Land of Women" like his predecessor Jayāpīḍa "with fleet coursers" and to reach this land he had to cross a great sandy desert while returning after conquering the land of the *Yakṣas* on his way back to Kāśmīra from Mount Kailāsa.

अश्वैः कृत्वा पवनगतिभिर्लङ्घनं वालुकाब्धे-
र्यैः स्त्रीराज्यं व्यजयत जयापीडतुल्यप्रभावः ।

Now we draw the following conclusions :

(i) *Strīrājya* existed from early times, during the sixth, eighth and eleventh centuries.

(ii) It is mentioned along with Kulūta, Halada etc. in the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, and to reach it one had to cross a desert while returning from Mount Kailāsa to Kāśmīra.

Now on the map of Asia, we see that just above Mobangcha, or Mānasaravar, there is the Kailāsa Peak. Preceding north-west we reach Gartok where the Indus just takes its rise, and then further down on the Indus, we get Demchok. Proceeding just a bit north-west we reach the frontier of modern India. It was about this region that the ancient country of Uttarakuru stood, where polyandry and succession through females were in vogue, and of which it is stated in the *Mahābhārata* that women could do everything at their will. It was for these reasons that this small district of Uttarakuru was afterwards termed the land of Amazons or *Strīrājya*. Asoka's men went to Tibet, China and other lands and he had Ariana within his empire. But this *Strīrājya* was neither annexed nor did he try to propagate Buddhism

[11] XVIII, 57.

therein. Hence *Harṣacarita* supplies us a tradition which may be called genuine history.

It may also be noted here that the Pāṇdya Kingdom was in his days called "the regimen of women" [12] and Aśoka actually did not annex this.

---

12 Smith, *Early History of India*, 3rd edition, p. 451.

ON SOME EARLY REFERENCES TO THE KAUṬILĪYA ARTHAŚĀSTRA.

BY

J. JOLLY, PH.D., M.D., D.C.L. (OXON.),

Professor of Sanskrit, University of Würzburg, Tagore Law Professor (1883), University of Calcutta.

The antiquity of that unique composition, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, which has thrown such a flood of new light on the ancient political institutions of India, is abundantly proved by the numerous quotations given from it in standard Sanskrit texts. Thus a large number of quotations from, and express references or parallel passages to, the *K. A.*, has been collected by Mr. R. Shamasastry, in the preface to his excellent translation, from Kāmandaka's *Nitisāra*, Daṇḍin's *Dasakumārcarita*, Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, Vatsayāna's *Kāmasūtra*, Kalidāsa's *Śakuntalā*, Somadevasūri's *Nītivākyāmṛta*, Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, and other well-known works. In support of Mr. Shamasastry's statements, I beg to subjoin some passages from the early Sanskrit commentaries on the Code of Manu, Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya* especially, which according to Dr. Bühler, was written in the ninth century A. D. The passages are taken from Rao Saheb Mandalik's edition of the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* with seven commentaries, published in three volumes at Bombay (1886).

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 52.

पानद्यूतयोः पानं गरीयः तत्र हि संज्ञाप्रणाशः अनुन्मत्तस्योन्मत्तत्वमप्रेतस्य प्रेतत्वं कौपीनप्रकाशनं श्रुतप्रज्ञाप्रहाणं मित्रहानिः सद्भिर्वियोगः असद्भिश्च संप्रयोगः गीतादिष्वर्थघ्नेषु प्रसङ्गः...... द्यूते तु जितमेवाक्षविदुषा......स्त्रीद्यूतव्यसनयोर्द्यूतव्यसनं गरीयः...... ।

K. A., VIII, 3.

पानसम्पत् संज्ञानाशः अनुन्मत्तस्योन्मत्तत्वमप्रेतस्य प्रेतत्वं कौपीनदर्शनं श्रुतप्रज्ञाप्राणवित्तमित्रहानिः सद्भिर्वियोगोऽनर्थ्यसंयोगस्तन्त्रीगीतनैपुण्येषु चार्थघ्नेषु प्रसङ्ग इति ॥ (p. 328, 1st ed.)

द्यूते तु जितमेवाक्षविदुषा......द्यूतस्त्रीव्यसनयोः कैतवव्यसनम्...... । (p. 327, 1st ed.)

The whole disquisition on the four-fold vices of a king, and the relative nature of the evils caused by them, is common to both works, though the arrangement differs.

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 54.

पुरोहितः स्वल्पकार्ये राज्ञा व्याजेनाधिक्षिप्तः बहुनार्थप्रदानेनात्मपुरुषैरेकैकममात्यमुपजपेत् राजविनाशाय । एतच्च सर्वं मन्त्रिभ्यो रोचते । अथ कथं भवत इति । प्रत्याख्याने धर्मोपधाशुद्धः । परिव्राजिकान्तःपुरे लब्धविश्वासा एकैकममात्यमुपजपेत् सा राजमहिषी भवन्तं कामयते कृतसमागमोपायेति प्रत्याख्याने कामोपधाशुद्धः । राजप्रयुक्ता एव केचित्पुरुषाः प्रसादमाविष्कुर्युः कृतसमयैरमात्यै राजा हन्यत इति ।......तेषामेव चान्यतमः पूर्वमेव कृतसंवित्कः प्रत्येकं राजामात्येषूत्साहयेत् । तत्र ये प्रत्याचक्षते ते भयोपधाशुद्धाः ।

K. A., I, 10.

पुरोहितमयाज्ययाजनाध्यापने नियुक्तममृष्यमाणं राजा अवक्षिपेत् । स सत्रिभिः शपथपूर्वमेकैकममात्यमुपजापयेत्......सर्वेषामेतद्रोचते कथं वा तवेति । प्रत्याख्याने शुचिरिति धर्मोपधा । परिव्राजिका लब्धविश्वासान्तःपुर कृतसत्कारा महामात्रमेकैकमुपजपेत् । राजमहिषी त्वां कामयते कृतसमागमोपाया........ प्रत्याख्याने शुचिरिति कामोपधा । प्रवहणनिमित्तमेकोऽमात्यः सर्वानमात्यानावाहयेत् ।......प्रत्याख्याने शुचिरिति भयोपधा ।

Medhātithi seems to have mixed up the धर्मोपधा with the अर्थोपधा. On the other hand, his reading व्याजेनाधिक्षिप्तः is better than अवक्षिपेत् in the *K. A.*, as the dismissal of the Purohita is meant as a stratagem for the purpose of testing the honesty of the ministers.

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 104.

वाल्लभ्येनोपगृहीतः पश्चान्माना-धिकाराभ्यां भ्रष्टः प्रवासितबन्धुस्तद्वल्लभः प्रसभमभिपूज्य स्वीकृतः सकुल्यैरन्तर्हितः सर्वस्वमाहारितस्तत्समानकर्मविद्योऽन्यः पूज्यते सोऽवधीर्यत इत्येवमादिक्रुद्धः। केनचित्कृतं पैशुन्यं तत्समानदोषेभ्यो दण्डितः तं सर्वाधिकारस्थाः सहसोप-पादितार्थं इत्यादिर्लुब्धवर्गः। परिक्षीणः कदर्यो व्यसनबहुल्य इत्यादिभीतवर्गः। आत्मसंभावितः शत्रुपूजार्चनरतः तीक्ष्ण-साहसिको होमेनासंतुष्ट इत्येवमादि-रवमानितवर्गः।

K. A., I, 14.

वल्लभावरुद्धः.......मानाधिकाराभ्यां भ्रष्टः तुल्यैरन्तर्हितः प्रसभाभिमृष्टस्त्रीकः सर्वसमाहारितः बन्धनपरिक्लिष्टः प्रवा-सितबन्धुरिति क्रुद्धवर्गः।.........तुल्य-दोषदण्डेनोद्विग्नः......सर्वाधिकरणस्थः सहसोपचितार्थः......इति भीतवर्गः। परिक्षीणोऽत्यात्तस्वः कदर्यो व्यसन्यत्या-हितव्यवहारश्चेति लुब्धवर्गः। आत्म-संभावितो......शत्रुपूजामर्षितो नीचै-रुपहितस्तीक्ष्णः साहसिको भोगेना-संतुष्ट इति मानिवर्गः।

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 147.

इमान्यङ्गानि कर्मणामारम्भोपायः पुरुषद्रव्यसंपत् देशकालविभागः वि-निपातप्रतीकारः कार्यसिद्धिरिति।

K. A., I, 15.

कर्मणामारम्भोपायः पुरुषद्रव्यसंपत् देशकालविभागः विनिपातप्रतीकारः कार्यसिद्धिरिति पञ्चाङ्गो मन्त्रः।

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 149.

तिर्यग्योनिषु च शुकसारिकादयोऽपि मन्त्रं भिन्दन्ति गवाश्वादयोऽपि।

K. A., I, 15.

शुकसारिकाभिः मन्त्रो भिन्नः श्वभिरन्यैश्च तिर्यग्योनिभिः।

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 152.

नवं हि द्रव्यं येनार्थजातेनोपदिश्यते तत्सदा दूषयति एतमसंस्कृतबुद्धयो यद्यद्दुष्यन्ते तत्तत्प्रथमं गृह्णन्ति।

K. A., I, 17.

नवं हि द्रव्यं येन येनार्थजातेनोप-दिह्यते तत्तदाचूषति। एवमयं नव-बुद्धिर्यद्यदुच्यते तत्तच्छास्त्रोपदेशमिवा-भिजानाति।

Medh. on *M.*, VII., 153.

कक्ष्यान्तरेष्वन्तर्वंशिकसैन्याधिष्ठितोऽन्तःपुरं प्रविशेत्। तत्र स्थविरस्त्रीमतिशुद्धां देवीं परिपश्येन्नापरिशुद्धां देवीम्। शय्यालीनो हि भ्राता भद्रसेनो मातुः शयनान्तर्गतः कुपुत्रश्शस्त्रविषदिग्धेन नूपुरेणावत्सं देवी जघान मेखलायाः सौवीरं वेण्यां गूढेन शस्त्रेण विदूरथं तस्मादेतानि यत्नतः परीक्षेत। मुण्डजटिलकुहकप्रतिसंसर्गं बाह्यदासीभिरन्तःपुरदासीनां प्रतिषेधयेत्।

K. A., I, 20.

कक्ष्यान्तरेष्वन्तर्वंशिकसैन्यं तिष्ठेत्। अन्तर्गृहगतः स्थविरस्त्रीपरिशुद्धां देवीं पश्येत्। न कांचिदभिगच्छेत्। देवीगृहे लीनो हि भ्राता भद्रसेनं जघान। मातुः शय्यान्तर्गतश्च पुत्रः कारूशम्। लाजान्मधुनेति विषेण पर्यस्य देवी काशिराजम्। विषदिग्धेन नूपुरेण वैरन्त्यं मेखलामणिना सौवीरं जालूथमादर्शेन वेण्यागूढं शस्त्रं कृत्वा देवी विदूरथं जघान। तस्मादेतान्यास्पदानि परिहरेत्। मुण्डजटिलकुहकप्रतिसंसर्गं बाह्याभिश्च दासीभिः प्रतिषेधयेत्।

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 154.

पञ्चवर्गः कापटिकोदास्थितगृहपतिवैदेहिकतापसव्यञ्जनाः परधर्मज्ञाः प्रगल्भच्छात्राः कापटिकास्तानर्थमानाभ्यामुपसंगृह्य मन्त्री ब्रूयात् राजानं मां च प्रमाणं कृत्वा यत्र यदकुशलं तत्तदानीमेवाख्यातव्यं त्वयेति। प्रव्रज्यायाः प्रत्यवसित उदास्थितः स च प्रज्ञाशौचयुक्तः सर्वान्नप्रदानसमर्थायां भूमौ प्रभूतहिरण्यायां दासकर्म कारयेत्। कृषिकर्मफलं तच्च सर्वप्रव्रजितानां ग्रासाच्छादनावसथात्प्रतिविदध्यात्। तेषां ये वृत्तिकामास्तानुपजपेदेवमनेनैव वृत्तेन राजार्थश्चरितव्यो भक्तवेतनकाले चोपस्थातव्यमिति।

K. A., I, 11.

कापटिकोदास्थितगृहपतिकवैदेहकतापसव्यञ्जनान् सत्रितीक्ष्णरसदभिक्षुकीश्च। परमर्मज्ञः प्रगल्भः छात्रः कापटिकः। तमर्थमानाभ्यामुत्साह्य मन्त्री ब्रूयात् राजानं मां च प्रमाणं कृत्वा यस्य यदकुशलं पश्यसि तत्तदानीमेव प्रत्यादिशेति। प्रव्रज्याप्रत्यवसितः प्रज्ञाशौचयुक्त उदास्थितः। स वार्ताकर्मप्रदिष्टायां भूमौ प्रभूतहिरण्यान्तेवासी कर्म कारयेत्। [कर्मफलाच्च सर्वप्रव्रजितानां ग्रासाच्छादनावसथान् प्रतिविदध्यात्। वृत्तिकामांश्चोपजपेत् —एतेनैव दोषेण राजार्थश्चरितव्यो भक्तवेतनकाले चोपस्थातव्यमिति।

The remainder of this chapter, up to संवादयेयुः।, is also given by Medh., the final portion only being omitted. A portion of Chapter XII, including some of the verses, is also found in Medh.'s gloss on *M.*, VII, 154.

Medh. on *M.*, VII, 191.	*K. A.*, X, 5.
समानतन्त्रेणोक्तं-द्वे शते धनुषां गत्वा राजा तिष्ठेत्प्रतिग्रहः। भिन्नसंघातनार्थं तं न युध्येताप्रतिग्रहः॥	द्वे शते धनुषां गत्वा राजा तिष्ठेत्प्रतिग्रहः। भिन्नसंघातनं तस्मान्न युध्येताप्रतिग्रहः॥
Medh. on *M.*, VII, 205.	*K. A.*, VI, 2.
समानतन्त्रेऽपि दैवं न यानयोर्मानुषं कर्मलोकं पालयतीति।	दैवमानुषं हि कर्म लोकं यापयति।

It might be objected to this, perhaps, that none of these texts is expressly attributed to Kauṭilya by Medhātithi and that, therefore, they might have been taken by him from some other work on Polity than the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra.* However, the last two questions, in Medhātithi's glosses on *M.*, VII, 191 and 205, profess to have been given from a work called *Samānatantra,* and this is a very apposite title for a work like the *K. A.*, in which the phrase इति समानं पूर्वेण or इति समानम्, "The same as before," is of constant recurrence, see e.g., I, 11; V, 1; VII, 6; XIII, 2; XIV, 1, as a convenient means of avoiding lengthy repetitions. Nor was the name of Kauṭilya, or Cāṇakya, which is the same, unknown to Medhātithi, as may be gathered from his gloss on *M.*, VII, 43, he refers to the चाणक्यादिग्रन्थविदः, "those who know the book composed by Cāṇakya and other such books," i.e., works on *Nīti.* The second book or *Adhyakṣapracāra* of the *K. A.* is twice quoted by Medhātithi with that designation, in his glosses on *M.*, VII, 61 and VII, 81, and though the texts thus quoted are not actually traceable to the printed edition of the *K. A.*, there is nothing in them which might not have occurred in that work.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that Medhātithi was well acquainted with the *K. A.*, and the same remark applies to some of the other standard commentators of the Code of Manu, such as Kullūka and Govindarāja.

It may be mentioned, finally, that Sāyaṇa-Mādhava (xiv. cent.), in his celebrated work on the Philosophical Systems of India, the *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha*, seems to be referring to some such composition as the *K. A.*, when he says near the beginning of his work :—

प्रायेण सर्वप्राणिनस्तावत्......नीतिकामशास्त्रानुसारेणार्थकामावेव पुरुषार्थौ मन्यमानाः पारलौकिकमर्थमपह्नुवानाश्चार्वाकमतमनुवर्तमाना एवानुभूयन्ते ।

"The mass of men, in accordance with the *Śāstras* of policy and enjoyment, considering wealth and desire the only ends of man, and denying the existence of any object belonging to a future world, are found to follow only the dictates of Cārvāka" (Cowell). Even so it is emphatically declared in the *K. A.*, I, 7, that wealth alone is important, according to Kauṭilya. The materialistic doctrines of Cārvāka are also mentioned with approval in the same work (I, 2).

ON FOUR MUSALMĀNI FOLK-SONGS FROM THE DISTRICT OF CHITTAGONG IN EASTERN BENGAL.

BY

SARAT CHANDRA MITRA, M.A., B.L.

Corresponding Member of the Anthropological Society of Bombay,
Lecturer in Anthropology, University of Calcutta.

The ancestors of the majority of the Musalmāns of Eastern Bengal appear to have been Hindus who were converted to Islam during the Mahomedan regime. This is evidenced by the fact that their latter-day descendants still retain some of the customs and usages of their Hindu forbears. Their personal names are composed partly of Hindu and partly of Mahomedan cognomens. Their boys are not only taught the tenets of the *Qurān*, but are also instructed in the legends of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. Their widows wear the unbordered *sāris* and cut their hair short just like Hindu widows, and object to cow-killing. Their houses are adorned with Hindu mythological pictures. Those among them who are gifted with the poetic vein compose songs not only about Hindu mythological subjects but sometimes also in honour of the Hindu gods and goddesses. This will be apparent from the folk-songs Nos. II and III from the district of Barisal in Eastern Bengal, which I have published elsewhere.[1] The Chittagong folk-songs Nos. II and IV, which are published below, also testify to the same fact.

[1] See my article in the *Hindustan Review* (Allahabad) for August, 1917, pp. 115-119.

The four Musalmāni folk-songs given below have been procured from the district of Chittagong in Eastern Bengal, where they are stated to be current among, and sung by, the Mahomedan folk. The first of these songs appears to be the composition of a Musalmān rustic poet named Jallāl, as will appear from its 5th line. While the use of the words दरिया (river) and सांइ (God) in the second of these songs also points to its Mahomedan origin. The bare text of these four folk-songs in Bengali script has been printed in the *Baṅgīya-Sāhitya-Pariṣat-Patrikā* (Vol. XXII, B. S. 1322, p. 240).

I reproduce below the texts in Devanāgarī script[1] and the translations into English (together with some notes) of these four Musalmāni folk-songs.

I.

The first is as follows :—

१। (मोरे) याइबार काले सङ्गे निबा किरे भाइ सदागर,—असमेर सारथि केओ नाइ।

२। नओया नुकाखानि लैया, बाणिज्येते आइलाम धाइया, घाटेते पुराना हैया याय रे भाइ सदागर।

३। कबे भासियाछ मन, कामाइला किबा धन, याइबार काले सङ्गे निबा कि।

४। रे भाइ सदागर।

५। निर्ब्बोध जल्लाले बले, नुकाटी आन्या दि पाले, ठेकिल नुका ठाडा बालुर चड़े।

६। रे भाइ सदागर।

1. O (my) brother merchant! will you take me) with (you) at the time of going? (There) is no one (to act as my) pilot (lit., charioteer) in my evil times.

[1] The Bengali spelling has been retained throughout.

2. Taking (with me) the new boat, (I have come in all haste (lit., running fast) to (carry on) trade. O (my) brother merchant! (the boat) is becoming old at the ferry (or *ghāt*).

3 and 4. (O my) mind! When did (you) come? What wealth have (you) earned? O (my) brother merchant! will you take (me) with (you) at the time of going?

5 and 6. O (my) brother merchant! foolish Jallāl says: (I) have brought the boat under full sail. (But) the boat has struck on (a) sand-bank, (and) is lying stranded high and dry (lit. is standing).

This is an allegorical song wherein the singer has likened his body to a new boat, and his birth and subsequent life in this world to the bringing of the boat, and the subsequent carrying on of a trading enterprise, and the acquisition of merit by the performance of virtuous acts in this worldly life to the earning of wealth in this trading enterprise. In this song, the singer further apostrophises to himself thus:— "I am getting old, and the day of my death is drawing nigh. There is no worthy spiritual preceptor to teach me as to how I should act in my old age. What virtuous acts have I performed during life-time so that I may hope for salvation after death?"

II.

Then the second song runs thus:—

१। श्याम भो परबासी रे।

२। (घोषा) कारे कइयम दुःखेर कथा केबा शुने काने।

३। दरियाते धूल गुंजरे भिच्छ मारे बाने।

४। उजान घांडाय धूल गुंजरे पिड़ा लइ याय होते।

५। गङ्गा मरे जल तियासे, बरमा मरे शीते।

६। लाहुर दरियार माझे निरञ्जनेर खेला, पाथर भासिया उड़े, तल पड़ि याय सोला।

७। लाडुर दरियार ढेउ बेङ्गे धरि खाय, पाथर छेदिल घुणे केबा प्रत्यय याय ॥

1 and 2. O Syāma (or Kṛṣṇa who is) in exile (in Bṛndābana)! (O) Ghoṣa (or Kṛṣṇa) ! to whom shall (I) tell (my) words of sorrow ? Who will listen (to them) with (his) ears ?

3. The mud (lit. dust) is contained in the river. The tidal waters (lit. the flow-tide) are laving (lit. striking) the banks (of the river).

4. The mud (lit. dust) is contained in (the waters of) the ebb-tide. The (tidal) current is carrying away the wooden seat (*piḍā*).

5. (The goddess) Gaṅgā (or the river Ganges) is dying of thirst for water. (The god) Brahmā is dying of cold.

6. (There is a miraculous) play of the Creator (*nirañjana*) in the middle of God's river. The stones are floating up, (while) the *solā* (wood of the *Æschynomena paludosa*) is sinking (lit. falling) to the bottom.

7. Who will believe (that) the frogs are getting hold of (and) eating up the waves of God's river, (and that) the weevils have bored through the stones ?

This song is also allegorical. The meaning of the 3rd and 4th lines is very obscure ; and my translation thereof is conjectural. The purport of this song appears to be to emphasise the omnipotence of God, who can bring about the occurrence of the unnatural events mentioned in the 5th, 6th and 7th lines, namely, the sinking of the light *solā* wood, the floating of the heavy stone, the frogs eating up the waves, the weevils boring through the stone, and so forth.

III.

Then comes the third song which runs as follows :—

१। भागमेर भेद तोमरा जान पण्डित।

२। मरमेर भेद तोमरा जान पण्डित।

३ । बारुइ गिये गाछ कोंदाते बारुइरे कोंदाय गाछे ।

४ । दांयबा छिड़ि दड़ि धाइल, जाल्यारे दौड़ाय माछे ॥

५ । जोमपहरे धान हुयात दिल, पातिलात दिल बाड़ा, मादार गाछे धरियाछे आठ्या, कलार छड़ा आंभांसत, पांभास निल पांभास रैल डाले ।

६ । तिन गरु दि नय हाल चय, छिबाय मानुष गिलें ।

1. (O) my learned man! do you know the mysteries (or secrets) of the *Śāstras* (*āgama*)?

2. (O) learned man! do you know the mysteries (or secrets) of death?

3. The cultivator of the betel-leaf has gone to climb the tree (upon which the betel-creeper has been trained, for the purpose of plucking the betel-leaves). (But) the tree is climbing up the cultivator of the betel-leaf.

4. The rope, tearing (itself) off (from) the cow (which is tethered by means of this rope), ran away. The fish is running (after) the fisherman.

5. The paddy was spread out to dry upon the hills inhabited by the Jumiā tribe, (but) was unhusked in an earthen vessel. The *mādāra* tree (*Artocarpus lakoocha*) has borne (fruits containing) hard-shelled pips. (The plantain tree has borne a) bunch (of plantains) in the sky. The *pānās* (?) took the *pānās* (which) remained in the water.

6. Nine ploughs are being drawn by three cows. (An) angling-rod swallowed up (a) human being.

This is also an allegorical song; and its purport also appears to be to emphasise the omnipotence of God, who alone can cause the most unnatural events mentioned in the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th lines to happen.

IV.

Then I come to the 4th and last song which runs thus :—

१ । मन, साधु जेनेछिलाम तोरे ।

२ । ए कि करिलि आर, ए कि व्यवहार, ये कर्म्म तोमार जानाब काहारे ।

३। आश्वासे विश्वास जन्माइये आमार,
महाज्ञान धन करिलि अधिकार,
शेषे भुलाइले कालीर नाम आमार,
ए देह-भाण्डार अर्पिलि शत्रुरे।
४। ज्ञान-माजिष्टरे दरखास्त करिब,
ब्रह्ममयीर पाशे याइते तोरे निब,
तिनटि काल तोमाय आबद्ध राखिब,
तारिणी श्रीचरण कारागारे।

1. (O my) mind! (I) had known you (to be) pure (lit. saintly).

2. What is this (that) you have done again? What means (lit. is) this act (lit. conduct of yours)? To whom shall (I) tell what you have done?

3. Having inspired me with confidence (in your purity) you have overpowered (lit. taken possession of) (my) precious Divine Knowledge (by means of which I see my tutelary goddess Kālī) and at last, you have made (me) forget my (tutelary goddess) Kālī's name, (and) have surrendered this (valuable) store-house (of my) body to my enemies (*i.e.*, the rule of the five passions).

4. I shall make (a) petition to the Magistrate, Wisdom. I shall take you (with me) (while) going to (the goddess) Brahmamayī (or Kālī). (I) shall keep you bound to the auspicious feet of (my) Protectress (the goddess Kālī) for all the three ages (*i.e.*, for ever).

This song is also an allegorical one and describes how the innate goodness of man's nature is overpowered by the baser passions which cause him even to forget God.

The interesting dialect-words used in the four folk-songs are given in the annexed glossary.[1]

[1] The figure after each word indicates the number of the song in the foregoing text, in which the particular word has been used.

अ

असमैर (1)—In evil times.

आ

आंआंसत (3)—In the sky.
आइलाम (1)—(I) have come.
आब्या (3)—(A fruit—containing) hard-shelled pips.
आन्या दि (1)—(I) have brought.

उ

उजान घाडाय (2)—In (the waters of) the ebb-tide.

क

कइयम (2)—(I) shall tell.
कामाइला (1)—(You) have earned.
कारे (2)—To whom.
केओ (1)—No one.
कोंदाते (3)—To climb up (gerund).
कोंदाय (3)—Is climbing up.

ग

गिये (3)—Has gone.
गिले (3)—Has swallowed up.
गुंजरे (2)—Is contained.

घ

घुणे (2)—Weevils.
घोषा (2)—Kṛṣṇa.

च

चड़े (2)—On a sand-bank.
चय (3)—Are being driven.

छ

छिड़ि (3)—Tearing (itself) off (gerund).
छिबाय (3)—An angling-rod.
छेदिल (2)—Have bored through.

ज

जाल्यारे (3)—The fisherman.

जोम पह्वरे |(3)—Upon the hills inhabited by the Jumiā tribe. The Jumiās are a wild tribe of aborigines inhabiting the Chittagong Hill Tracts.

ज्ञान-माजष्टरे (4)—To the Magistrate, Wisdom.

ठाडा (1)—Is lying stranded high and dry; lit. is standing.

ठेकिल (1)—Has struck.

त

तियासे (2)—Thirst.

तल (2)—To the bottom.

द

दरियार (2)—Of the river.

दरेयाते (2)—In the river.

दांयबा (3)—A cow.

दि (3)—By.

दिलबाड़ा (3)—Was unhusked.

दौड़ाय (3)—In running (after).

ध

धरि खाय (2)—Are getting hold of (and) eating up.

धाइया (1)—In all haste; lit. running fast (gerund).

धाइल (3)—Ran away.

धूल (2)—Mud, lit. dust.

न

नभोया (1)—New.

निल (3)—Took.

निबा (1)—Will (you) take?

नुक खानि
नुका
नुकाटी } (1)—The boat.

प

पड़ि याय (2)—Is sinking; lit. is falling.
परवासी (2)—In exile (in Bṛndāban).
पांञास (3)—Meaning unknown; fifty (?).
पाथर } (2)—The stones.
पात्थर }
पातिलात (3)—In an earthen vessel.
पाले (1)—Under full sail.
पिड़ा (2)—A wooden stool.
पुराना (1)—Old.

ब

बरमा (2)—Brahmā.
बाने (2)—The flow-tide.
बारुइ (nominative) } (3)—The cultivator of betel-leaf.
बारुइरे (accusative) }
बालुर (1)—Of sand; sand-(bank).
बेङे (2)—Frogs.

भ

भासिया उड़े (2)—Are floating up.
भिराइ (2)—The banks (of the river).

म

मारे (2)—Are striking.

र

रैल (3)—Remained.

ल

लइ याय (2)—In carrying away.
लाइर (2)—Of God.
लैया (1)—Taking (gerund).

ह

हाल (3)—Ploughs.

हुयात दिल (3)—Was spread to dry.

हैया याय (1)—Is becoming.

होते (2)—The (tidal) current.

SOME MOSLEM WRITERS IN HINDI.

BY

GANGAPATI SINGH, B.A.,

Tanknath Chaudhuri Lecturer in Maithili,
University of Calcutta.

The Muhammadans after they had conquered India, finally settled in it and came into intimate contact with a highly civilised people and being the minority of the population, they had to learn the language of the people, though their court language was Persian. In some cases it is known that some early Muhammadan rulers in India kept even the records of their administration in the language of the people prevalent round their seats of government. Some scholars having made minute and deep study of the history of the early Muhammadan rulers of India, have found out that even Muhammad ibn Kasim, Muhammad Ghaznavi and Shahabuddin Muhammad Ghori had the records of their Indian administration written in archaic Hindi and not in Arabic or Persian. Hasan, the founder of the well-known Bahmani kingdom had as his Minister of Accounts his old Brāhmaṇa master Gangu, who kept his records in Hindi.

Akbar, the greatest statesman amongst Moslem rulers gave great impetus to Hindi. His policy of conciliating the Hindus, in which he was also followed by his son and grandson, also fostered and encouraged intimate connections between Hindus and Muhammadans and this induced many Muhammadans of the time, to write in Hindi. Akbar himself learnt Hindi and also encouraged his son, grandson and his courtiers to learn Hindi and patronized many Hindi poets. Hindi

received similar patronage at the hands of Shah Jehan, as well. Though Aurangzeb, the worst politician amongst the Muhammadan rulers of India, was highly prejudiced against Hindu religion, manners and customs, yet he did not discourage Hindi and Sanskrit. Even so far as the art of music is concerned Muhammadan rulers and Moslem musicians admired many Hindi *rāgs* and *rāgiṇīs*. Thus there remained practically no chasm or gulf between Hindi and Persian. Hindi began to imbibe many Persian words, while the Persian vocabulary was enriched by Hindi and Sanskrit words. Besides, many among the Muhammadans, who had the poetic gift in them, began to compose poems in Hindi. Their excellence and beauty lies in the fact that though such poets were Muhammadans by faith, still they had fully imbibed and assimilated Hindu culture.

The Krishna cult of devotion and love of God had much in common with the mysticism of the Sufis and hence most of the Muhammadan poets, who were inclined that way, found in it much to attract them and some of them have even excelled devout Hindu, in their devotional writings.

Above all the glorious history and achievements of the Rajputs, who, though enemies, were looked upon with respect, proved to be a great source of inspiration to some of the choicest among the Moslem poets. The seasons, the achievements of great heroes and heroines, which had been popular amongst the Hindus since the time of Kālidāsa, roused the poetic fire of not a few Moslem poets.

It is towards the beginning of the twelfth century that Muhammadan authors make their first appearance in Hindi literature. Among the pre-*Rāsō* period poets we find the names of three Moslem writers Masaud, Kutub Ali and Akram Faiz.

Masaud, the son of Saad was a Hindi poet. He flourished in the beginning of the 12th century. No work of his has been up till now discovered, but his name as a good Hindi poet is found mentioned in authoritative Hindi works.

Kutub Ali is said to have submitted a complaint and prayer in versified Hindi to Maharaja Jai Singh of Anhilpur, to the effect that some Hindus had dug out a tomb in his possession. This Maharaja reigned from 1075 to 1125 A.D. No systematic work of his has yet been discovered.

Akram Faiz was a native of Marwar. He composed one *Bartalla Kāvya* and the Hindi version of *Vṛtti Ratnākara* between 1130 and 1188 A.D. He is said to have been born in 1104 A.D. He had for his patron Maharaja Madhav Singh of Jaipur, whose court he adorned.

Of the post-*Rāsō* period poets the name of Amir or Mīr Khusro is very famous. He was a good poet in Persian and Urdu as well.

After him there was another author named Mullah Daud who wrote about the love episode of Nurak and Chand in versified Hindi. *Chandravan* is said to have been written in praise of Juna Khan. Then comes Kutvan Shekh, whose work *Mṛgavatī*, a love story, has been brought to light by the diligent researches of Shyam Sunder Das and Radha Krishna Das.[1] It is a book written in *dohā* and *chaupāi* metres. It was composed in 1495 A.D. and is as voluminous a book as the *Padmāvat* of Jāyasī.

The chief characteristic of Kutvan's poetry is that he lays down a precept in the first part of his *dohā* and illustrates it in the latter part. His illustrations are always most apt and perfect. He composed many Hindi verses in *Kharibolī* and also verses in mixed Hindi and Persian. Besides he composed a lexicon called *Khalikbari* containing Arabic and Persian words with Hindi equivalents. This *Khalikbari* is even now included in the curriculum of the *Maktabs* (Urdu Schools) in some parts of India. He is credited to have laid the foundation of the union of Persian and Hindi and the production of a new language called Urdu. But he is more

[1] Published under the auspices of the Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Benares.

famous for his fine and perplexing riddles called *Pahalis* and *Dhakosalas* which are on the lips of all Hindi-knowing people. He died in 1307 A.D.

Of all the early Muhammadan writers of Hindi Literature the name of Malik Muhammad Jāyasī stands foremost for more reason than one. It is said that the real name of Malik Muhammad Jayasi was Muhammad only. "Malik" was his title. Because he is said to have belonged to the town of Jāyasa, he went by the name of Jāyasī. This place Jāyasa is still a big town and railway station in the district of Rai Bareli in Oudh and is even now mostly inhabited by Muhammadans.

The dates of the birth and death of Jāyasī still remain contested and unsettled. As regards internal evidence in his two works, viz., *Akkhrāvat* and *Padmāvat*, the former does not contain any mention of the time when it was composed, but in the latter it has been held by some that the poet mentioned that he commenced writing it in the year 927 A.H. corresponding to 1520 A.D. But this seems perplexing because the poet himself mentions in his book that he composed it during the reign of Sultan Sher Shah[2] who ascended the throne of Delhi in 1540 A.D. (947 A.H.) As for this Dr. Grierson holds that 927 A.H. is probably an error for 947 A.H. But the Miśra Brothers have tried to solve the difficulty by suggesting that it is quite probable that Jāyasī *began* his *Padmāvat* in the year 927 Hizra or 1575 Samvat Era (*i.e.*, 1521 A.D.), and that he dedicated his work to Sher Shah when he had completed it, because according to the usual literary conventions of Moslem poets any book must needs contain some words of prayer to the Supreme Being and to the Prophet and some panygeric of the reigning sovereign. But the real fact is that critics have been labouring under a misapprehension and have been giving a wrong and curious

[2] सेरसाह दिल्ली सुलतानु, चौदह खन्ड तपा जिमि भा ु।

interpretation of the line in *Padmāvat*, which is supposed to give the date of the composition of that poem. The line, **सन नव सै सतादश ग्रहै, काथा प्रारम्भ बेन कवि कहै**, clearly and in unambiguous terms indicates that poet Bena (and *not* Muhammad Jāyasī) related this story in 927 A.H. Nowhere in the body of the book does the poet call himself by the name of Bena.

Under the circumstances it seems quite probable that the interesting and famous story of Padminī and of the siege of Chittaur by Alauddin which took place in 1303 A.D. (some two centuries and a half before the time of Jāyasī), like the stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, might have furnished many poets with their theme and a version by Bena might have been well-known at that time, and regarded as worth-mentioning by Jāyasī.

As to the brithplace of Jāyasī, the generally accepted theory is that he was a native of the above-mentioned town of Jāyasa. But the line in the *Padmāvat* which says that the poet came to the sacred town of Jāyasa and gave forth the story there,[3] is likely to create doubts in the minds of the readers. This may lead us to think that he might have belonged to some other place, that because the town Jāyasa was well-known as a sacred spot, so with a view to popularise his poem, he might have come to this place and recited his works to the populace. Besides the poet had for his spiritual preceptor Sayyed Ashraf who was living there[4] and thus his close connection with the town would have led people to believe that he also was born there. Moreover one version of the tradition in that part of the country furnishes us with the information that he belonged to the town of Ghazipur in Fatehpur District. His teacher, or *Vidyā Guru*, Shekh Burhān belonged to Kālpi far away from Jāyasa.

[3] जायस नगर धरम असथानू, तहाँ जाय कवि कीन्ह बखानू।

[4] सैय्यद अशरफ पीर पियारा, जो मोहि पन्थ कीन्ह उजियारा।

Jāyasī was well-known as a Musalman Faqir and tradition says that the Raja of Amaiṭhī, who was one of his principal devotees, was blessed with a son through his prayers. When the poet died he was buried at the gate of the Raja's fort at Amaiṭhī where his tomb is even now worshipped.

His masterpiece *Padmāvat* on which his fame rests deals with the renowned episode of Rāṇī *Padmāvatī*.

King Gandharva Sen, who reigned in Siṃhala Dvīpa, (Ceylon) had an exquisitely beautiful daughter named Padmāvatī who, it is said, also possessed the attributes of the highest class of woman called Padminī as enunciated by the writers on the Indian science of erotics.[5] The girl had a pet parrot named Hirāman for which she had extreme fondness. Once it so happened that the parrot was lost to her and it was sold to Rāṇā Ratan Singh of Chittaur. Once the parrot spoke highly in praise of the beauty and accomplishments of the fair Padminī before the Rāṇā's queen Nāgamatī, who was very proud of her beauty. The Rāṇā, being enamoured of the idea of her beauty and accomplishments, went out in search of the girl with the parrot disguised as a Sannyāsī. With great difficulty the Rāṇā's efforts, under the able guidance of the parrot, were at last crowned with success and the fair Padmāvatī was married to Rāṇā Ratan Singh. For some time the happy pair is said to have lived in perfect happiness. But as the saying goes, "the course of true love never does run smooth", and our hero and heroine were no exceptions to it.

Alauddin, then ruling at Delhi, hearing about the extraordinary beauty and accomplishments of Padmāvatī from Ragho, the dismissed astrologer of Ratan's court, fell sick with love for her. Repeated entreaties having failed, Alauddin is said to have besieged Chittaur for twelve long years but failed to get hold either of the impregnable fortrees

[5] सम्पूर्णेन्दुमुखी विशालनयना पीनस्तनी दक्षिणा मृद्वङ्गी विकसारविन्दसुरभिः श्यामाथ गौरद्युतिः ।
अल्पाहाररता विलासकुशला हंसस्वनागामिनी लज्जालुर्गुरुदेवपूजन परा स्यान्नायिका पद्मिनी ॥

Moreover, the insertion of the episode of Alauddin's enjoying a sight of the dazzling beauty of Padmāvatī reflected in a glass, might have been introduced to remind the readers of the Sānkhya-system of Hindu Philosophy. There we find that Prakṛti is *jáḍa* or inactive and Puruṣa is *nirlepa* and *udāsīna* or uncontaminated and unmoved like a drop of water on a lotus leaf. When the reflection of Puruṣa falls on Prakṛti, she gets *jñāna*; in other words, she becomes conscious of her powers and being active, commences the creation of the world. Delusion or *mithyājñāna* (Alauddin) was thus brought in contact with true wisdom or *tattvajñāna* (Padminī).

The language of the poem is said to be the dialect spoken in the villages surrounding Jāyasa and scholars are of opinion that his poem became very popular because he wrote for the people in the people's own tongue. Besides, the language of the poem is a mixture of the various dialects of the people. But though the style is simple, the book is full of figurative turns abounding in similes and metaphors. The poet has made a good display of his descriptive powers, elegance of style and his fondness for hyperbole while describing seasons, prayers, love-affairs, marriage and the various limbs of the heroine.

Jāyasī seems to be have been Muhammadan by faith, but Hindu by culture. The latter aspect is so strong that in describing Hindu manners and customs, in classifying female emotions and the ten different stages of suffering while separated from the beloved, in the knowledge of Āyurvedic medicines and of Hindu astrology, in the mastery of the Sanskrit metres and of Hindu theology, and in his praises of Lord Śiva and his description of the pathetic scene of the Satī Jāyasī excels even a devout Hindu. For instance :

नागमती पद्मावत रानी । दोउ महासत सती बखानी ॥
दोउ सौत चढ़ खाट जो बैठी । औ शिवलोक परा तहँ दीठी ॥
बैठो काउ राज चौपाटा । अन्त सबै बैठे पुनि खाटा ॥

चन्दन अगर काढ़ सर साजा। औ गति देय चले लै राजा॥
बाजन बाजहिं होय अगोता। दोउ कन्तलै चाहै सोता॥
एक जो बाजा भयो विवाहू। अब दुसरे है और निवाहू॥
जियत जलै जो कन्तकी आसा। मुये रहत बैठे इक पासा॥ [6]

The poet seems to have made a thorough and minute study of the *Purāṇas* and the traditions current among the Hindus about renowned ascetics :

तू राजा जस विकरम आदी। तू हरिचन्द बइनु सतवादी॥
गोपिचन्द तुइँ जीता जोगा। अउ भरथरी न पूज विओगा॥
गोरख सिधि दिनहु तोहि हाथू। तारी जूकं मछिन्दर नाथू॥ [7]

The poem became so very popular and had such a wide circulation even in the days when the printing press had not yet been introduced into India, that even in the remotest corners of India the poem was read and admired by all lovers of poetry and it grew so much in popularity that even its translations into other provincial vernaculars were held in high esteem. To illustrate this an account of its Bengali version may be added here.

Magan Ṭhākur, the Moslem minister of the ruling chief of Arakan, had patronised a scholar named Alaul, who was born about the year 1618 A.D. and lived, almost to the end of the 17th century. The latter while a youth once undertook a sea-voyage with his father and after a narrow escape from capture by Portuguese pirates, he had fled to Arakan, where he

[6] Both Nāgamatī and Padmāvatī were true Satīs. Both the wives sat on the funeral couch and thus saw the abode of Lord Śiva. A man may sit on a throne, but at last everyone must needs sit on such a funeral couch. Sweet refreshing *agaru* and sandal paste were applied to their foreheads, and musical instruments were played. For the first time these musical instruments were played on the solemn occasion of their marriage and for the second and last time, it is done now. Had the queens been alive they would have been subject to the intense pangs of separation from their lord, but by dying in this manner they would always live together.

[7] O king, you are like Vikramāditya; true to your word, like Hariśchandra; you are like Gopichandra and Bhartrihari in whom Gorakhanāth lit the intellectual light.

was hospitably received by Magan Ṭhākur, who highly appreciated his scholarship. When he was about forty years old, Magan Ṭhākur ordered him to translate into Bengali the *Padmāvat* of Muhammad Jāyasī. In order to please his noble patron he quickly finished his task to the intense delight of Magan. Besides, Alaul is said to have undertaken the Bengali translations of various Persian works also, like the *Shaif-ul Mulla* under the orders of the same patron. But when this work was half finished Magan died. At the same time Shuja, the brother of Aurangzeb, had fled to Arakan and in the fight that ensued between the two brothers Shuja was defeated. A wicked man named Mirza in order to satisfy a private grudge inviegled Alaul into Shuja's party, and consequently he was imprisoned in 1658 and subjected to great cruelties but was at last released. In the latter part of his life he finished the translation of *Shaif-ul Mulla.* Besides this he also wrote sequels to the stories of Gorachandra and Maina by Daulat Kazi and the translation of the Persian poem *Hashtapaikar* by Nizam Ghaznavi. His last literary work consisted of a few detached Krishna songs.

Coming back to the particulars of the translation of the *Padmāvat*, all the manuscripts of this translation hitherto obtained belong to the borderland of Arakan in the backwoods of Chittagong, copied in Persian character and preserved by the rural Muhammadan folk of these localities. In the year 1893 Shaik Hamidulla of Chittagong published it in Bengali characters. What is surprising about this book is that this book was copied, read and admired by the Muhammadans of Chittagong, though the style is extremely Sanskritic. Alaul's translation is said to be an improvement on the original both in quantity and quality. The original poem contains 1,000 lines while the translation contains 1,500 lines. Besides, the translation is notably free and is also marked by great originality, though conforming in the main to the original. Rai Bahadur Dr. Dineschandra Sen, the famous historian of

Bengali Literature, is of opinion that with his finished Sanskritic expressions in the Vernacular, mastery in word-painting, Alaul heralded the age of the classical revival, the age of Bhāratchandra. The following description of Padminī's beauty shows the artificial taste of the times:—

কনকমুকুর জিনি মুখজ্যোতি সাজে।
দেখই অপূর্ব রীতি বদন উপরে।
পদ্মযুগ বন্দী হয় চন্দ্রের মাঝারে।
শত্রুমাঝে মিত্র বন্দী দেখি দিবাকর।
ধরিয়া সিন্দুররূপ আইলো নিয়র।
ভুরুযুগ ধনুক ধরিয়া পঞ্চবাণ।
তিলে তিলে হান বান কটাক্ষ সন্ধান।
কমল নয়নী মাত্র মনে এই দুঃখ।
নিকটে থাকিয়া মিত্র ন দেখায় মুখ।[8]

The *Akkhrāvat*, as its very name suggests, contains detached verses, each beginning with a letter of the Hindi alphabet from अ to ह. These verses deal with the praises of the Almighty Father and the transitoriness of the world.

There is great diversity of opinion about the date of the birth and death of Kabīr and about his caste. Some even hold that he was a Brāhmaṇa, but the more accepted tradition is that he was a *julāhā* (weaver) by caste. This is corroborated by Kabīr's own writings in the *Ādigrantha*, wherein he says, addressing a Brāhmaṇa, that he is a weaver of

* The light that beams in the face of Padminī, puts to shame the light reflected from a golden mirror. One curious fact with regard to the face is that two lotuses (her two eyes) are confined within the disc of the moon (her face). The sun on finding his friends so confined by his enemy, came to their rescue in the shape of the vermilion mark on her forehead; and Love in aid of the sun held aloft his bow (her eyebrows) and aimed his shafts (the glances of her eyes). The only regret of these two lotus-friends is that though placed close to each other, they could not see each other.

Benares and the Brāhmaṇa should understand his theological theories.[9] The tradition round the city of Benares says that he was the son of a virgin Brāhmaṇa widow, who out of shame threw him on the banks of the Lohar tank in the city. By chance, a weaver, Niru by name, and his wife Nimā, passing by that way and finding the deserted baby, brought him home and nursed him as their own son. In course of time boy became famous by the name of Kabīr.

As regards the dates of his birth and death, the tradition amongst the Kabīr Panthīs or followers of the religious order founded by him, says that he lived for 300 years from 1205 to 1505 of the Samvat era. In *Kabir Kasauṭī* the dates of his birth and death are respectively 1455 and 1575 of the Samvat era and these have been generally accepted by the learned members of that religious sect.

As regards the question of his marriage some hold that he remained a bachelor throughout his life. Others hold that he had a wife named Loī, a son named Kamāl and a daughter named Kamālī. This is also attested by the oft-quoted tradition which says that the family prestige of Kabīr was at stake as he had a wicked and vicious son in Kamāl.[10] Kabīr from his very childhood was a man of extraordinary genius and of a strongly religious turn of mind. Afterwards he became a disciple of the famous Rāmānanda. Kabīr is said to have tried to modify the Vaishnava doctrine so as to include Hinduism and Muhammadanism alike. "The God of the Hindus", he preached, "is also the God of the Musalmans, though called by a different name". Though he was not educated yet his teachings and writings are very thoughtful, precious and deep. He was loved and revered by the Hindus and the Muhammadans alike. Tradition says that on his death there arose a quarrel between the Hindus and the

[9] हम कबीर काशी के जुलहा बूझहु मोर गियाना।

[10] डूबा बंश कबीरका उपजा पूत कमाल।

Muhammadans. While the Moslems wished to bury him, the Hindus, claiming him as one belonging to their religion, insisted on burning him. And this dispute was settled by a miracle which satisfied both.

He himself did not write any book but composed detached verses called *Bhajans* and *Sākhīs.* After his death his disciples systematised and arranged these, and put them in the form of separate books. Nine such books are recorded in the *Khās-grantha*, one of the sacred books the Kabīr Panthīs ;—(1) *Sukh-nidhān*, (2) *Gorakhnāth kī Goṣṭhī*, (3) *Kabīr Pañjī*, (4) *Balakh kī Ramaiṇī*, (5) *Ānand Rām Sāgar*, (6) *Śabdāvalī*, (7) *Maṅgal*, (8) *Bījak* and (9) *Sākhīs.*

Two or three specimen verses from his writings may be quoted here :—

दुःख में सुमिरन सब करै सुख में करे न कोई ।
जो सुखमें सुमिरन करे तो दुःख काहेको होई ॥ [11]
पीया चाहे प्रेमरस रखा चाहे मान ।
एक म्यान में दो खड्ग देखा सुना न कान ॥ [12]
पानी केरा बुद्बुदा अस मानुषकी जात ।
देखत ही छिप जायगी ज्यों तारा परभात ॥ [13]

Kamāl Kavi was the son of the celebrated Kabīr. He was born in 1450 A.D. It is believed and said that he devoted his whole time and energy to the composition of verses for refuting his father's teachings. This belief has for its foundation an oft-quoted proverb which says that an unlucky

[11] Everyone remembers God when overcome by calamities, but none remembers Him when happy. If one remembers Him in his bright days, why should dark days come to him at all ?

[12] One who wants to taste the savour of true love and also to preserve the honour and dignity (of the world) can never succeed. None saw or heard of two swords kept within one scabbard.

[13] The life of man is like a bubble of water; it appears and is obscured like stars in the morning.

family was Kabīr's, in which an unworthy like Kamāl was born.[14] But from the perusal of his verses, we find, on the contrary, that Kamāl was as good and sincere a devotee of Rāma as his revered father.

रामके नामसों कांम पूरन भयो लच्छिमन नाम ते लच्छि पायो।
कृष्णके नामसों वारिसों पार भये विष्णुके नाम विश्राम पायो॥
आइ जग बीच भगवन्तकी भक्ति को और सब छाड़ि जंजाल छायो।
कहत कमाल कबीर का बालका निरखि नरसिंह पह्लाद गायो॥ [15]

Next in importance comes Rahīm whose full name was Abdul Rahim Khānkhānā. He was the son of Bairām Khān and was born in 1556 A.D. and died at the ripe age of seventy. He was a great favourite of the Emperor Akbar who appointed him his chief commander and minister and he continued to adorn the post down to the time of Jehangir. But he is also said to have greatly offended the Emperor Jehangir and for this reason he was put into prison for some years. He was deeply versed in Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit. He was a great patron of learning and hence learned men from all parts of India flocked round him. Tradition runs to the effect that he made a princely grant of three lakhs of rupees to the poet Ganga for the composition of a single couplet. He was a benevolent and philanthropic man. He was a great devotee and preacher of the Krishna-cult. It is said that once when his enemies made a serious complaint against him to the emperor he spoke out: "These liars and thieves cannot injure me even a bit so long as I have for my

[14] See Footnote 10 above.

[15] By uttering the name of Rāma a man's desire is fulfilled, the name of Lakshman makes a man achieve his aim, the name of Krishna makes one ford the river of worldly life, and by uttering the name of Vishnu one gets rest. By coming to the world we become devotees of the Lord but worldly cares and anxieties are enveloping us. The poet Kamāl, the son of Kabīr, says that Prahlad had sung this at the sight of Narasiṃha.

protector Lord Krishna, who has a great love for butter". He was an extremely cool-tempered man and it is said of him that throughout his life he never uttered an angry word or lost his temper. It is said that he was loved and admired by Gosāin Tulsīdās. Once he had completed a *dohā* (composed by Tulsıdās and given to a Brāhmaṇa) so aptly that it pleased the Gosāin extremely. Rahīm made a deep study of human nature and of the ways of the world. He entertained extraordinary love and regard for Rāṇā Pratāp and always spoke warmly in praise of his patriotism and his sense of self-respect, in spite of the fact that he was a life-long antagonist of his master and patron, Akbar. It is said that once the wife of Rahīm was captured by the Rāṇā's men, but when the Rāṇā was informed of the fact, he treated her very respectfully and sent her back to her husband. Rahīm, out of gratitude, dedicated many verses written in the Rājasthānī dialect to Rāṇā Pratāp. Of his works only *Rahīm Śatsāī*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Rasapañcādhyāyī*, *Śriṅgār Soraṭh* and *Madanāṣṭak* are still extant. Though he was vastly learned in Sanskrit and Arabic his style is always very simple. His similes and metaphors are always apt and homely. His *dohās* are full of teaching. A few of them may be quoted here:

तरुवर फल नहिं खात है सरवर पियहि न पान ।
कहि रहीम परकाज हित सम्पति सुचहि सुजान ॥ [16]
कहि रहीम सम्पति सगे बनत बहुत बहुरीत ।
बिपति कसौटी जे कसे तेई साँचे मीत ॥ [17]
रहीम न दानि दरिद्रतर तऊ जाँचिबे जोग ।
ज्यों सरितन सूखा परे कुवां खनावत लोग ॥ [18]

[16] Trees do not eat their fruit themselves, lakes do not drink their water themselves; Rahīm says that the property of the good is for the benefit of others.

[17] Rahīm says that when a man has wealth he has got lots of relations and friends, but those who stand by in the time of adversity should alone be reckoned as true friends.

[18] Rahīm says that even if a beggar fails to get anything from a rich man, he may approach the poor, because when a river is dried up, a man may dig a well and get water from it.

The name of Akbar the Great stands next in importance, not because he was a great poet but because he was a great patron of Hindi literature. He himself learnt Hindi and also composed detached verses, many of which are still extant. He had his son Jehangir taught Hindi and had employed one Bhūdatta Brāhmaṇa to coach his grandson Khusro in Hindi at the age of six only; and these things produced such an effect that it is said that Shah Jehan was as well-versed in Hindi as in his own mother-tongue.

Owing to his encouragement and kind patronage Raja Todar Mall, the musician Tānsen, Faizi, Abul Fazal, Narahari, Ajñesh, Kavi Ganga, Rahīm and other courtiers of Akbar produced Hindi works.

The full name of Raskhān was Sayyed Ibrahim. He was a scion of the Pathan royal family and an inhabitant of Delhi. Some hold that he was an inhabitant of Pihani, district Hardoi, but resided for the greater portion of his life in Braj. He was born towards the end of the 15th century A.D. and he composed a poem named *Prem Bāṭikā* in 1615 A.D. In a book treating of the lives of 252 Vaishnavas, it is mentioned that he was dotingly in love with a Bania's son and roamed day and night with him. Though people laughed at him and ridiculed him, he did not in the least care for it. Once it so happened that four Vaishnavas were conversing amongst themselves on religious topics. One of them said, "We Vaishnavas should be as much attached to God Vishnu as Raskhān is to the shopkeeper's son". Raskhān overheard it and it moved him deeply. He at once fell at their feet and thenceforth he turned his mind to God and became an adorer and worshipper of Krishna and went to live in Braj. His poems are full of sweetness and show his devotion to the beloved Krishna.

मानस हौं तो वही रसखानि बसौं ब्रज गोकुल गाँव के ग्वारन ।
जौं पशु हौं तो कहा बस मेरो चरौं नित नन्दकी धेनु मझारन ॥

पाहन हौं तो वही गिरिको जो धरयो करछत्र पुरन्दर धारन ।
जौं खग हौं तो बसेरो करौं मिलि कालिन्दीकूल कदम्ब की डारन ॥ [19]

Alam was originally a Sanāḍhya Brāhmaṇa. He was born in 1700 A.D. He flourished during the reign of Aurangzeb and served for a long time under Prince Muazzam, the son of Aurangzeb. He was, as the tradition goes, initiated into Islam for a very peculiar reason mentioned below. Once Alam gave his turban to a woman dyer named Shekh to have it dyed. Through oversight he left tied up with it a piece of paper containing one line of a *dohā*, which was composed by himself and left over to be completed later:

कनक छरी सी कामिनी काहेको कटि छीन । [20]

When Shekh took the turban home, she unloosened it, read the line and composing the following second line of the couplet tied it in the same manner to the turban after she had dyed it:

कटिको कञ्चन काटि विधि कुच मध्य धरि दीन्ह ॥ [21]

The moment Alam got back his turban and found therein his couplet so aptly and so beautifully completed, he ran to the house of that woman and paid her one anna for dyeing

[19] In case I am born a human being (in my next birth) I wish I were amongst the milkmaids of Braj and Gokul, in case I am born a beast I should like to graze and roam in company with the cows of Nanda, if I be born a stone I would like to be one in the mount Govardhana which was raised up by Krishna, and in case I am born amongst birds I should like to have my nest in the branches of the Kadamba trees on the banks of the Jamunā.

[20] The lady is like a thin stick of gold, why is it that her waist is slender?

[21] The Creator, taking out some of the gold from the waist of the damsel, has put it about her breasts.

the turban and one thousand rupees for completing the *dohā*. The mutual admiration thus kindled in their hearts gradually deepened into love and culminated in their marriage and Alam's conversion to Islam. Both Alam and Shekh thenceforth began to compose Hindi poems jointly.

No systematic works of Alam and Shekh have yet been discovered. Some detached verses, however, full of erotic sentiments, are still extant.

Sayyed Mubarak, an inhabitant of Belgram, was born in 1583 A.D. He was well versed in Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit. His verses are really beautiful. Of his works only *Alak Śatak* and *Tilak Śatak* have yet come to light.

अलक वर्णन

अलक मुबारक तिय वदन लटकि परी यों साफ ।
खुसनवीस मुनसी मदन लिख्यो काँच पर क़ाफ ॥ [22]
लगि दृग अञ्जन दिग अलक देत मुबारक मोद ।
जनु साँपिनि सुत आपनो भेंटति भरि भरि गोद ॥ [23]
अलक डोर मुखछबि नदी बेसरि बंसी लाइ ।
दै चारा मुकुतानि को मो चित्त चली फंदाइ ॥ [24]

Kādirbakhsh was born in 1578 A.D., at the village Pihani in the district of Hardoi. He was the disciple of

[22] Mubarak says that the locks of hair curled so nicely round her face that it seemed as if Love, like an expert Munshi, had traced out a *qāf* ق on a plate of glass.

[23] The locks of her hair straying near her blackened eyes, seemed as if a female serpent were taking its young ones into her embrace.

[24] The look of her hair is like the string, the beauty of her face is the river, her nose-ring is the hook, and Madan, the god of Love, putting this bait of pearls is going to capture my mind.

Sayyed Ibrāhim. Of his works only a few detached verses are extant.

Jamāluddin, or Jamāl Kavi as he is popularly called, was born in 1545 A.D. He was also an inhabitant of Pihani in the district of Hardoi. He has left for us many emblematic verses (कूट) which are rare in Hindi literature.

Abul Faiz, alias Faizi, was the son of Shekh Mubarak and brother of Abul Fazl. He was greatly loved by Akbar. He was born in 1547 A.D. He was a great Sanskrit scholar as well. He also wrote many detached verses in Hindi.

Nazir was an inhabitant of Agra and flourished in the beginning of the 16th century. He wrote a book called *Nazīr kī Shair* which became very popular. It contains verses full of erotic sentiments.

The poet Ahmad was born in 1613 A.D. He was a Sufi by religion. He was well versed also in the Vedānta system of Hindu philosophy and his verses in *dohā* and *sorṭhā* metres deal with philosophical ideals, especially of the Vedānta.

The poet Tāhir composed one book in versified Hindi called *Koka Sabhā* or the Science of Love. His poems are sweet and melodious. He flourished at the end of the sixteenth century and was an inhabitant of Agra.

पदुम जाति तन पदुमिनि रानी । कंज सुबास दुवादस बानी ॥
कंचन बरन कमल कइ बासा । लोइन भँवर न छाँड़त पासा ॥
अल्प अहार अलप मुख बानी । अल्प काम अति चतुर सयानी ॥
सेत बसन अरु सेत सिंगारा । सेत पुहुप मोतिन के माला ॥ [25]

[25] A woman of Padminī class has these twelve signs. Her complexion is of the hue of gold; a sweet smell as of a lotus comes out from her limbs; and hence black bees hover round her; she is temperate in her meals, in her talk, in her enjoyments; she is very expert in her work and she is wise; she likes to wear white garments; and likes her ornaments all white; and she wears white flowers and necklaces of white pearls.

The poets Zulfikār (b. 1725 A.D.), Yusuf Khān (b. 1754 A.D.) and Muhammad, better known as Paṭhān Sultān (b. 1704 A.D.) are said to have written an excellent commentary in *Kuṇḍalīya* metre on *Bihāri Śatsāī*. But unfortunately only a few *Kuṇḍalīyas* of Paṭhān Sultān are now extant, but these are unique in Hindi literature for their beauty.

SĀYAṆA'S COMMENTARY—ITS COMPOSITION.

BY

DR. P. D. GUNE, M.A. (BOM.), PH.D. (LEIPZIG)

Professor of Sanskrit, Fergusson College, Poona.

Immemorial tradition has held that the great minister-recluse Sāyaṇa is the author of the commentary of the *Ṛgveda*, called the *Vedārthaprakāśa.* This belief is founded on the couple of verses that preface every *adhyāya* of the eight *aṣṭakas* and on the colophon at the end of each. One of these verses is invariably a salutation to Vidyātīrtha, the Guru and the predecessor of Sāyaṇa on the *Pīṭha*, and runs thus :—

यस्य निश्वसितं वेदा यो वेदेभ्योऽखिलं जगत् ।
निर्ममे तमहं वन्दे विद्यातीर्थमहेश्वरम् ॥

The second, whenever it is there, makes mention of the fact, though differently at different places, that Sāyaṇa, the *ācārya*, has commented on such and such an *adhyāya.* The sixth *adhyāya* of the first *aṣṭaka*, (the first place where such a verse occurs), has the following :—

दाशतय्यां पञ्चमोऽयध्यायो व्याकृतः पुरा !
धीमता सायणार्येण षष्ठोऽध्यायोऽथ वर्ण्यते ॥

Or the first *adhyāya* of the last *aṣṭaka*, for instance, has this verse :—

सत्यमेऽष्टममध्यायं व्याख्यायाचार्यवंशजः ।
अष्टमे सायणाचार्य आदिमं व्याकरोत्यथ ॥

* This article is among the last written by the talented writer. He died, deeply regretted by all his friends, shortly after sending this contribution.—I. J. S. T.

In some verses, Sāyaṇa has been called *amātya*; *e.g.*—

व्याख्याय प्रथमं विद्वानष्टमस्याष्टकस्य सः ।
अध्यायं सायणामात्यो द्वितीयं व्याचिकीर्षति ॥

At the beginning of the fourth and fifth *adhyāyas* of the sixth *aṣṭaka*, the parents of Sāyaṇa are mentioned as being Śrīmatī and Māyaṇa.

The colophon always reads as follows:—

इति श्रीमद्राजाधिराज......श्रीवीरबुक्कभूपालसाम्राज्यधुरंधरेण सायणाचार्येण विरचिते माधवीये वेदार्थप्रकाशे ऋक् संहिताभाष्ये......etc.

But one important fact has to be remembered, that not every *adhyāya* has the second verse which refers to Sāyaṇa.

The following table will clearly show the position:

Aṣṭaka.	Reference to Sāyaṇa in *adhyāyas.*	No such reference.
I	1	7
II	2	6
III	2	6
IV	2	6
V	1	7
VI	2	6
VII	5	3
VIII	5	3
Total	20	44

Of the sixty-four *adhyāyas* of the *Ṛgveda*-commentary, only twenty have reference to Sāyaṇa as the author of the commentary, and the remaining forty-four have no such reference.

They all begin in a business-like manner with the *sūkta* that is to be commented upon with only such an introduction as, अथ तृतीयाध्याय आरभ्यते or अथ द्वितीयाष्टके चतुर्थं सूक्तम् । This is rather strange, if Sāyaṇa was alone, or at all, the author of the commentary.

Even in the twenty verses which refer to Sāyaṇa, the reference is clearly in such terms as would indicate that some person or persons, with great respect for the ability and sacrifice of Sāyaṇa, are ascribing their work to him. It is not a case of the usual practice in Sanskrit works of mentioning the author in the third person. But this is of course subjective.

There are two verses in the second and sixth *aṣṭakas* which are of importance in this connection. They follow the usual salutation to Vidyātīrtha and are :—

प्रक्रिया प्रथमे काण्डे सा कात्स्न्येनोपवर्णिता ।
अत ऊर्ध्वंतनी नैया स्मर्यते च क्वचित् क्वचित् ॥[1]
षष्ठस्य सप्तमोऽध्यायः संग्रहात्संप्रदर्शितः ।
अथाष्टमः सुमतिना संगमेन प्रदर्श्यते ॥[2]

There is no mention of Sāyaṇa in these, although it could have been very easily knit into them, had the author so meant it. In the latter verse, for instance, *Sāyaṇena* could easily have been substituted for *sumatinā* or *saṅgamena*.

So much is at any rate clear from the above that we cannot place too much reliance on the score of verses that appear at the beginning of some score of *adhyāyas*. To pit against that one score, we have over two scores of *adhyāyas* which begin in a business-like manner, with perfect silence as to who wrote them.

Lastly, the verses at the very opening of the commentary ascribe the authorship, not to Sāyaṇa, but to his brother Mādhava. After the salutation to Vidyātīrtha, occurs the following :—

यत्कटाक्षेण तद्रूपं दधद्बुक्कमहीपतिः ।
आदिशन्माधवाचार्यं वेदार्थस्य प्रकाशने ॥

Mādhava, according to this, was commissioned by King Bukka to write a commentary on the *Ṛgveda*.

[1] *Aṣṭ.* II, *adh.* 1.
[2] *Aṣṭ.* IV, *adh.* 8.

But latter tradition, howsoever it might have arisen (and which was responsible for the score of verses which apparently were not there from the beginning) wanted to reconcile this with its belief, and is responsible, evidently, for the following additional verse :—

स प्राह नृपतिं राजन् सायणार्यो ममानुजः ।
सर्वं वेत्त्येष वेदानां व्याख्यातृत्वे नियुज्यताम् ॥

Happily, however, not all the manuscripts show this, and hence it is rightly relegated to the foot-notes in the authentic editions of the *Ṛgveda*.

The colophon apparently is the fruit of this reconciliation, for it speaks of the commentary as *Sāyaṇācāryeṇa viracite Mādhavīye Vedārthaprakāśe*, i.e. "Mādhava's *Vedārthaprakāśa* compiled by Sāyaṇa". This might suggest that one was among the actual workers and the other merely supervised and edited the work.

This last gives us the clue, as to how the whole stupendous affair of the commentary must have been arranged. For, apart from the common sense view that such a task could not have been achieved by one individual, especially when he was at the same time minister of a great kingdom, we have several facts supplied by the commentary itself, pointing to the unmistakable conclusion that many scholars must have collaborated in it. With all its imperfections,—and they are many (and we here see them no less clearly than scholars beyond the oceans), it is a monumental work of the middle ages, just as much as the *St. Petersburg Dictionary* is of the present age.

The imperfections and the contradictions, at which many scholars[3] fret, are therefore natural; and one cannot reconcile oneself with the view that any body, least of all Sāyaṇa, could be so opaque as not to see the folly of explaining the same

[3] See, for instance, Macdonell in his "Principles to be followed in translating the Veda", in the *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 7 ff.

word differently in different passages, although the context and other conditions were the same.

Among the points won from an examination of some parts of the commentary the first and the most evident one is that the *aṣṭaka* and not the *maṇḍala*, appears to have been taken as the unit in the commentary.

While commenting upon I, 184, 3, which refers to the Aśvins, the commentator says, *ayam itihāso Brāhmaṇe "Prajāpatir vai somāya rājñe" ityāmnāto 'smābhiḥ prathamāṣṭake prapañcitaḥ.*

He does not say, *prathamamaṇḍale* but *prathamāṣṭake.*

Verses or parts of verses repeated as burdens or otherwise in the same *aṣṭaka* are explained only once. Afterwards they are left untouched with remarks like *gatam etat*, *vyākhyātam etat* or *siddhārtham etat*; or *vyākhyātā*; cf. II, 2, 13, which is the same as II, 1, 16; II, 14, 12 which is identical with II, 13, 13; II, 15, 10; II, 18, 9 and II, 19, 9; which are the same as II, 11, 21; and III, 5, 11 and III, 6, 11 which are the same as III, 1, 23; and are, therefore, left alone.[4]

But III, 7, 11 which is the same as III, 6, 11; III, 5, 11 and III, 1, 23, is explained again. This would be inexplicable, had it not been for the fact, that the verse explained, although a repetition viewed from the point of view of the *maṇḍala* is in a different *aṣṭaka*. The three latter are in the second *aṣṭaka*, whereas III, 7, 11 is in the third. This suggests that the two units were explained by different persons.

The different *aṣṭakas* or even half-*aṣṭakas* appear to have, as a general rule, different commentators.

This verse, *iḷām agne purudaṃsam*,[5] etc. has been twice commented upon because, as we have seen, it occurs in two different *aṣṭakas*, the second and third. Now had the author of the two *aṣṭakas* been the same, he would either not have

[4] The figures here and elsewhere throughout refer to *maṇḍala*, *sūkta* and *ṛk*.

[5] III, 1, 23 and 5, 11; 6, 11; 7, 11.

commented upon it, or would at least have repeated the explanation of the verse that he had first given; because after all, the two verses are not separated by more than some six *sūktas*. From the following quotations it will be seen that, not only is the same explanation not repeated, but in the case of one important word the two explanations actually differ. The two are as follows:—

(1) III, 1, 23:—हे अग्ने पुरुदंसं बहुकर्माणं गोर्गवां सनिं प्रदात्रीमिळां भूमिं हवमानाय स्तुवते मह्यं शश्वत्तमं चिरकालं यथा भवति तथा साध साधय। नोऽस्माकं सूनुः पुत्रस्तनयः सन्तानस्य विस्तारयिता विजावा पुत्रपौत्रादिरूपेण स्वयं विजायते इति विजावा स्यात्। हे अग्ने सा प्रसिद्धा ते सुमतिः त्वदीयानुग्रहबुद्धिरस्मे अस्मासु भूतु भवतु।

(2) III, 7, 11:—हे अग्ने पुरुदंसं अपोऽप्नो दंसो वेष इति कर्मनामसु पठितत्वाद्दंसःशब्दः कर्मवाची, पुरूणि दंसांसि यस्याः सा। तां बहुकर्माणं गोः सनिं गवादिपशून्संपादयित्रीमिळामेतन्नामिकां गोरूपां देवतां शश्वत्तमं निरन्तरं हवमानाय यजमानाय मह्यं साध साधय। किं च नोऽस्माकं सूनुः पुत्रस्तनयः पौत्रः स्याद्भवत्विति ते तव सा सुमतिः शोभनाबुद्धिः सा विजावावन्ध्या सत्यस्मे अस्माकं भवतु। (This is followed by a grammatical explanation of important words, which is lacking in the first case.)

Ignoring synonyms like *pradātrīm*, and *sampādayitrīm*, *cirakālam* and *nirantaram*, *stuvate* and *yajamānāya*, we have to note the following important points of difference:—

(*a*) That *iḍām* is taken in the first explanation to mean the 'earth', and in the second to mean 'a goddess in the cow's form'; (*b*) that *vijāyā* is taken once as in apposition to *sūnuḥ* and *tanayaḥ* and as the subject of *syāt*, but in the second as an adjective of *sumatiḥ*, although the meaning in both the cases is approximately the same; (*c*) that in the second explanation *syān nas sunus tanayaḥ* is taken as a relative clause qualifying *sā*: 'the good wish that we should have a son and a grandson'. In the first explanation, the clause is taken as an independent, finite sentence and therefore *sā* in the last sentence is simply taken to mean 'that', i.e. 'famous'; (*d*) that the first is a bare

paraphrase, whereas the second has a reference to the *Nighaṇṭus* and gives necessary grammatical notes at the end.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the commentaries on the second and the third *aṣṭakas* are not from the same pen. While commenting upon I, 184, 3, the commentator, after having referred to the legend of the marriage of *Sūryā*, concludes, as we have seen, by saying: *ayam itihāso ityāmnāto 'smābhiḥ prathamāṣṭake prapañcitaḥ.* The verse of the first *aṣṭaka* referred to here is I, 119, 5 where again the reference is to the marriage of *Sūryā.* The words '*asmābhiḥ prathamāṣṭake prapañcitaḥ* are emphatic enough to show that the author of that part of the commentary is the same person as he of I, 184, 3. Since it appears that the work was not unevenly divided or shared piecemeal, we might presume that the latter half of the first *aṣṭaka,* and the latter half of the second, were apparently commented upon by one and the same person.

Reasoning in the same way, we might conclude that the commentator on VI, 63, 5 had no hand in the commentary on the above parts of the first and the second *aṣṭakas,* nor had he got them before him. For in that case, there would have been a clear reference to the fact here; for the legend in all the three verses is the same. But he only says *ayam arthaḥ prajāpatir vai ityādinā spaṣṭīkṛtaḥ.* The *Brāhmaṇa* passage, he thinks, elucidates it, and he makes no reference either to I, 119, 5 or to I, 184, 3. One,—can at once see the difference between the two,—the definite statement in I, 184, 3 and the mere reference to the *Brāhmaṇa* in VI, 63, 5.

A thorough examination of the commentary on these lines is bound to be fruitful. But the cases cited here are typical enough. This will prove, it is hoped, only the beginning of an exhaustive study of this stupendous work.

A careful study of the style of the commentary on the different *aṣṭakas* might, perhaps, lead to more definite results. But what has been brought forward is sufficient to

establish the case, that Sāyaṇa's commentary was not the work of a single hand.

A critical study of the exegetical and the grammatical parts of the commentary is also interesting in as much as it shows that, where the two were not blended together as in the latter part of the second *aṣṭaka*, as also in the latter part of the third, they belong to different persons.

For this purpose the last *aṣṭakas* are not of much importance, for, standing where they do, they scarcely required any grammatical notes. Most of the words therein had already gone before and had been explained by others and hence there was no necessity to explain them again. The *aṣṭakas* that are important for our purpose are therefore the first, the second and the third.

In the third *aṣṭaka* we find the first four *adhyāyas* keeping the exegetical and the grammatical parts scrupulously apart, while the last four have mixed them up. This fact itself is enough to make one suspicious. If, for instance, the same man wrote the commentary on one complete *aṣṭaka*, why should he change his plan abruptly in the middle? From III, 67 to IV, 4 (the first half of the third *aṣṭaka*) the grammatical notes have always been scrupulously given at the end of and after the exegetical notes. From IV, 5 there is a sudden change, which lasts to the end of the second-half, viz. to V, 8. Compare, for instance, the last verse of IV, 4 and the first verse of IV, 5: they are typical of the two halves of the *aṣṭaka*.

हे अग्ने अया अनया समिधा दीप्तया स्तुत्या ते त्वां विधेम परिचरेम । अस्माभिः शस्यमानमिमं स्तोत्रं प्रतिगृभाय प्रतिगृहाण । अशसः शंसन्ति स्तुवन्तीति शसः स्तोतारः ते न भवन्तीति अशसो नृशंसाः तानशसो दह भस्मसात्कुरु ।......। गृभाय ग्रहेर्लोटि छन्दसि शायजपीति श्नः शायच् । हृग्रहोर्भः etc.[6]

[6] IV, 4, 15.

सजोषाः सजोषसः समानप्रीतियुक्ता वयं...... । तत्र दृष्टान्तः उपमित्र रोधः उप समीपे मीयते क्षिप्यते इत्युपमित् स्थूणा, सा यथा तृणाच्छादनादिनिधरोकं वंशादिकं उपस्तभ्नाति तद्वत् । यद्वा वध्र्येन उक्थलक्षणेन फलादिवाहकेन स्तोत्रेण सह द्युलोकमुपस्तभायत् । स्तभु सौत्रो धातुः लङि छन्दसि शायजपीति व्यत्ययेनेहापि शायजादेशः ।......किमिव, उपमित्र रोधः उप समीपे मीयते इत्युपमित् उदकं कूलमिव ।[7]

The contrast is glaring. In the latter case there is only one grammatical note and that too comes in the body of the exegetical notes. The conclusion that two different persons wrote the two different parts becomes irresistible.

Where the two parts of the commentary are separate, the question of separate authorship will arise only when there are discrepancies between the two explanations (the exegetical and grammatical) of a word. The following are the most typical examples of such discrepancies; and they are by no means exhaustive.

(1) In I, 25, 3 *viṣīmahi* is explained in the exegetical part by *viśeṣeṇa badhnīmaḥ*, but in the grammatical explanation we find *sīmahi, ṣivu tantusantāne* offered first and as an afterthought *yad vā 'ṣiñ bandhane' ityetasmāt*. A man who some four lines above explained *ṣīmahi* by (*badhnīmaḥ*) we bind, is certainly not expected to derive the form from *ṣiv* (to sew) in the first instance.

(2) In I, 25, 9 *vartanim* in the exegetical portion means *mārgam*; but the grammatical annotator is wiser and says (while partly agreeing with the exegete) *vartate 'neneti vartanim stotram.* He has no idea that it has been taken to mean *mārgam* just above. Will one still believe that both are one, and that a man is capable of contradicting himself thus within a couple of lines? These are typical cases and ought to suffice to show that different persons were responsible for the two parts and not one.

[7] IV, 5, 1.

(3) In I, 32, 2 *vakṣaṇāḥ* is explained by *pravahaṇaśīlāḥ nadīḥ*; but the grammatical explanation is from *vakṣa roṣe.* The exegete, who has the whole verse and the context in his mind, gives one explanation, while the grammarian, who has no such care to weigh upon his mind, explains it in accordance with his own sweet will.

(4) In III, 12, 9 *paribhūṣathā* is explained in two ways, (i) *alaṅkṛtau bhavataḥ*, and (ii) *śatrūn paribhavataḥ*; i.e. from the roots *bhūṣ* and *bhū.* The grammarian has no idea of the latter derivation, for he simply remarks *bhuṣatha, bhuṣa bhuṣane nighātaḥ.*

(5) In III, 37, 1 *pṛtanāṣāhyāya* is rightly explained as *parakīyasenābhibhavāya* in the exegetical part; but in the grammatical notes we have *ṣah marṣaṇe.* There is a world of difference between *abhibhava* and *marṣaṇa*

(7) In III, 13, 5 *dhītibhiḥ* has an alternative explanation: *stutilakṣaṇābhir vāgbhiḥ* or *etad uddeśena kriyamāṇaiḥ karmabhiḥ,*—in the first case the derivative being from *dhī*, in the second from *dhā.* But the grammatical derivation is from *dheṭ pāne*, an entirely different root with a different meaning!

To sum up:—

(*a*) the commentary of Sāyaṇa was not the work of one man, although that is the traditional belief;

(*b*) several scholars collaborated in it;

(*c*) the *aṣṭaka*, or perhaps half of it, was the unit of division, each scholar undertaking to comment upon one or more such units;

(*d*) the grammatical and purely exegetical parts, when they were not mixed up together, were done by different persons;

(*e*) these facts are responsible for the imperfections and contradictions in Sāyaṇa's commentary.

MALABARI'S POETRY.[*]

BY

IRACH J. S. TARAPOREWALA, B.A., PH.D., BAR.-AT-LAW,
Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Calcutta.

धन धन गरवी गुजरात मातुश्री मारी रे !
निरखी वदनकमल रळियात, गाउं बलिहारी रे
घणे वरसे देखी साक्षात्, भेट थइ तारी रे.—
नडी अडचण दृश ने सात, धारी अणधारी रे
पण एके दिवस, मारी मात ! न तुजने विसारी रे;
गाळी नांखी आ झुरती जात, विरह् संभारी रे.
जोग थयो हवां, नहि भ्रांत, मातुश्री प्यारी रे,
मळयां नेत्र नेत्र संगाथ, आंख बन्ने ठारी रे.
अर्प्यां पुष्प नमीने, सुपात्र ! अल्प उपकारी रे ।
पुत्रभावथकी कहुं मात्र, आरती उतारी रे.[1]

The heart of every Gujarati thrills in response to these noble lines. In these Malabari has shown the main

[*] I am deeply indebted to Mr. P. B. Malabari, the poet's oldest son, for his help in this essay and also for permission to quote from his father's poetical works. The English renderings given in the footnotes are not translations but merely free paraphrasing. The beauty of the original cannot be reproduced.—I. J. S. T.

[1] Hail, hail, glorious Gujarat! Hail, O Mother mine! I see thy beautiful lotus face and I sing thy praises.

After long years, I have met thee again, seeing thee face to face, though many were the obstacles in the way, both expected and unexpected.

But, Mother mine, I had not forgotten thee even for a day; this weary body of mine has wasted away remembering the separation from thee.

Now there has come reunion with thee (no delusion this), beloved Mother mine; mine eyes have met thine and both my eyes have been satisfied.

With salutations I offer thee flowers, O worthy one!—a small offering; I have only performed the *ārti* on thee with all the devotion of a son.

inspiration of his life— a passionate and deep love for the land of his birth. No poet of Gujarati has sung of his land in more passionate words or with deeper feeling. For Malabari above all was a son of Gujarat and devoted to the service of his Motherland. Though he belonged to a race, who in his days (and even till recently) regarded themselves as different from the rest of the Indians, still he never regarded himself other than as an Indian; and even his language is not the "Parsi-Gujarati", but the purest type of the standard language of Gujarat. In fact Malabari was the first Parsi writer [2] to definitely take up the so-called "Hindu-dialect" to express his deepest emotions. He has acquired such a facility in the use of this language that when he tries to write in the "Parsi-dialect", he is not always successful: for Sanskrit words, which Parsis would call "Hindu-words", creep in. By using the standard dialect of Gujarat he led the way for a number of Parsi writers and his greatest service in the field of letters has been the drawing together of the Parsi and Hindu races in the service of their common mother-tongue. His writings are not numerous—his life was too much occupied with his work of social service and other activities—and we must admit that he has not received his due from the Gujarati people; at any rate he is chiefly remembered for his social and other activities rather than for his literary work. Two reasons may have contributed to this neglect. In the first place, being the first Parsi to write in the Sanskrit style, his Hindu contemporaries, on the one hand, were not inclined to take him seriously, while on the other hand, to most of the Parsis his writings, even to-day, are, as it were, in a foreign tongue. The second reason for the neglect is undoubtedly the fact that his political creed was not advanced enough for the young men of his days, and of course to-day most would regard him as hopelessly

[2] In the 19th century.

"oldfashioned". Yet it was he who was accused of "sedition" by the Director of Public Instruction in Bombay for his two Poems गुजरातनुं भावी गौरव and आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय.[3] It is unjust to run down a great writer for the reason that he devoted all his energies to the cause of social reform rather than to that of the Indian National Congress. Malabari had his limitations, but to deny his literary merit or to doubt the sincerity of his patriotic fervour is less than justice. I well remember him in his home at Bandra and I used half to fear and half to shrink from that short, strange-looking personage. He was very silent and very rarely did he open his heart to any one except to his intimate friends. I personally venture to doubt if any friend of his, except perhaps Mr. Dayaram Gidumal,[4] knew his inmost thoughts and aspirations. It was his silence before the world that caused many misunderstandings regarding him, but he was too deeply engrossed with his work to care for what people thought or said of him. He has occasionally put down his inmost feelings in some of his poems and they are most valuable in helping us to form a true estimate of the man. He was a true follower of Zoroaster in that he spent his life in *working for others* heedless of the opinion of the world and heedless of what his own reward might be.

Malabari has written most of his poems in the standard dialect, and few in the Parsi-dialect and also a few in Hindi. The latter two varieties show a distinct sense of labour. His language in these is palpably not spontaneous, though two at least of his finest poems are composed in these dialects. His best work, however, is in the dialect popularly called by his co-religionists "Hindu-Gujarati". When we remember how scanty was the education he received and under what

[3] *The Future Greatness of Gujarat* and *Self-help* (lit. *We cannot go to Heaven unless we die ourselves*), see also further on.

[4] Of the Bombay Civil Service, now retired, and still living at Bandra. The best account of Malabari's life is from his pen.

difficulties,[5] our wonder is all the greater at the purity of the language he uses. He was a born poet and thinker, not a mere rhymster. Of course the language he uses gets more polished with practice, but from the beginning one can clearly mark out the poet.

For convenience we may divide his poems into various classes according to their subject matter. They all reveal to us a great and essentially good soul, working silently at his appointed task, never caring for the opinions of others, but at the same time an extremely shrewd observer of human nature who could penetrate all outward hypocrisy and sham. As an observer of Nature, too, he is precise and accurate, as many of his metaphors show; but what most appealed to him was humanity, and though he penetrated beneath, and understood at their true worth, all outward shows, he still had a warm heart for his fellow-men.

Poems purely descriptive of natural scenes are few, but throughout his life he had the keenest appreciation for the grand and beautiful in nature. He was a lover of the sea all his life, and his home at Bandra was within sight of the western ocean. The fresh clouds of the monsoon rolling up across the tumbling waves have assuredly inspired the सागरस्तुति in his *Niti-vinod* :

सागर, तारी शी बलिहारी ? अपरंपार सुमार कयो ?
शक्ति न्यारी, चित्त चितारि, पूर्ण विचारी, छक्क थयो.
भरती ओटोनो नहि टोटो, साची तर्क सदाय रह्यो,
पळमां मोटो, पळमां छोटो बनी परपोटो गुप्त गयो.

* * * *

मेघतत्व वळी वेग कापतां ठेठ चढी आकाश मळे,
हेतवडे सौ नेत्र खेतोनां नेत्र नकी खीलो निकळे[6].

[5] Sardar Jogendra Singh, *B. M. Malabari*, Chaps. I-II.

[6] O Ocean, how great thy splendour! How limitless thy wide expanse! Picturing within my mind thy grandeur and meditating thereon I have been struck dumb with awe.

The following description of a storm at sea from *Wilson-Viraha* is vigorous, but the language is distinctly earlier and consequently not nearly so polished as in the later writings.

पवन छोडी कुल धजा, गजावे तुफान मारो,
सागर पाडे चीस देखी वायुनी सवारी,
मोजां नासानास करे त्यां वाराफरती,
नीचे मच्छ गभराय, उपर उछळती धरती.
ज्यां वायुनु जोर पाणी शुं करे बिचारां ?
नचाव्यां नाचे नाच फरी फरी गोल कुंडाळां.
झाझ उडी पछडाय सिंधुने हृदय अतीसे,
घायल थयलो मगर जेम तडफडतो दीसे.
वळी कामातुर चन्द्र पाणी पर मोहिनी नांखे,
आकुळ व्याकुळ प्रिया जोश ए केमे सांखे ?
मस गंजावर व्हाण, दिसे कण एवो नानो.
जेम गगनविस्तार विषे एक तलनो दाणो.
क्यां ए रजना भार ? पहाड ज्यां पिगळी हाले
धन, ईश्वर, तुज जोर ! व्हाण तुज सत्ये चाले ![7]

Thy ebb and flow is unending, but thou art ever thy very true self. Now thou art great, now thou art small, and sometimes thou art hidden in a bubble.

* * * * * *

Clouds laden with rain come rapidly across thee and cover all the sky; under their downpouring love the fields of corn spring up verdant before our eyes.

[7] The Wind, unfolding all his banners, has started a roaring storm; the Ocean shrieks as he perceives the onslaught of the wind.

The waves rush hither and thither and in whirling eddies, fishes down below are bewildered with the world tossing up above them.

Where the wind is strong what could the poor waters do? They dance as the wind bids them and churn round in huge whirlpools.

The ship is tossed up and down heavily upon the bosom of the ocean and looks like a wounded sea-monster splashing about.

And the love-lorn Moon throws his enchantment on the waters, how could he bear to see the tumult raging within the bosom his beloved (Ocean)?

The huge big ship looks *tiny*, like a small grain of *til* set against the surface of the sky.

Where would this speck be when mountains crumble and are tossed about? Glory to thee, O God! and to Thy power! The ship sails trusting to Thee alone.

The love poems scattered through his works are the reflection of the deep and happy love which had crowned Malabari's life. In those early days when marriages among Parsis were arranged by the elders without reference to the child-couple, Malabari had the good fortune to marry for love. The union was a happy one and Malabari was a devoted father and husband. The following two gems (both from *Wilson-Viraha*) are exquisite specimens of Gujarati love lyrics :

चांदाने अरज.

चांदा ! रे प्यारीने जोतो आवजे,
वियोगनो अनुभव तुजने रोज जो ;
संदेशो कांइ कहे तो व्हेलो लावजे,
बहु मुजने भावे छे रुदन मोज जो.

मारी गति तुं कहेजे, चांदा ! प्यारीने,
विरहचेहमां बळे राते मुज अंग जो ;
दिसे डगमग डोळे हैयुं हारीने,
प्यार पांख विण टळवळ करूं अपंग जो

हे चांदा ! जव आणे तारी चांदनि,
चन्द्रमुखी मारीने कहेजे एम जो ;
कमळकला विण मुज मन तृष्णा रहे घणी,
चकोर हुं चांदा विण जीवुं केम जो ?[8]

[8] A petition to the moon.

O Moon! do thou visit my beloved, for thou dost experience daily the pain of separation. If she sends a message bring it to me quickly for I am very fond of the luxury of tears.

Tell the beloved, O Moon! of my condition, how all night my body burns in the furnace of separation, and during the day my despondent, heavy heart is tossed about ; bereft of the wings of love, I thirst after her, unable to fly to her.

" O Moon! when thou dost bring thy moonlight with thee, tell thus to my moon-faced one that there is great yearning in my heart for the beauty of the lotus. I am the *Chakor*, how can I live without my Moon?

मेघने

अंधारीमां आवे जब तुं मेहुला !
झरमर झरतां तारां निर्मळ नेव जो ;
ते टाणे भूलिश मा रे मुजने मला,
गति मारी साचवजे, गरुआ मेघ ! जो.

जे वेळा तुं प्रीतमना मिलापथी,
धरतीनुं उर जळमय थई उभराय जो ;
ते वेळा मुज हैडुं विरहतापथी
बळी बळी निज आसनमां ज समाय जो.

वर्षा ! हुं तो पडियो तारे आसरे,
शीतल संदेशा मुजने संभळाव जो
बेठुं घोर अंधारूं मुज दिलमां खरे.
हे वीरा ! मुज वियोगविष उतराव जो ![9]

In another poem in *Niti-vinod* entitled सुखदु:खनो साथी he says:—

मातानी ममता अने स्नेह पितानो सार,
पूर्ण पवित्र ज तेथकी छे पत्नीनो प्यार.
वैभव आजे आवशे वळी काले वैराग,
अबळा प्रबळा थई तहीं झीलशे अडधो भाग.
संसारे शत्रु घणा, समजु सदन प्रधान ;
सफळ वास ते स्वामिनो, निर्धन पण धनवान.

*   *   *   *

[9] To the cloud.

When thou arrivest O Cloud! in the dark night, thy clear streams downpouring steadily, at that time do thou not, indeed, O gracious Cloud! forget me; have pity on my condition.

What time the heart of this Earth overflows in crystal streams upon meeting thee, her best beloved, at that time my heart, burnt up by the fire of separation, shrinks to a cinder within my breast.

O Rain! I am come to thee for refuge, bring thou to me refreshing messages; on my heart, indeed, deep darkness has descended; O gracious one! conjure away the poison of separation from me.

बळ जुलमना अग्निमां, चढे त्यागथी काट ;
बळ खाधेलो प्रेम ए नव छोडे मरडाट.[10]

The inconsistencies of love are well pictured in the poem प्रीति करी पस्ताउं [11] a beautiful piece in his *Saṃsārikā.* Among other things he says of the "ocean of love" that:

उष्ण प्रेमसिंधुमां बूडतां
शीत परसेवे न्हाउं,—प्रेमदा ! प्रीति करी पस्ताउं[12]

And then he says that no matter where he wants to lead the beloved, he himself is led by her ;

प्रीत रीत विपरीतज एवी
ताण करी क्यां तणाउं ? - प्रेमदा ! प्रीति करी पस्ताउं
तो पण प्रीति छे प्रबळ मोहिनी
वश थइ वळी मलकाउं, - प्रेमदा ! प्रीति करी पस्ताउं.[13]

The final summing up is the best verse of the whole poem ;

जीवनथी मीठो, कडवो मरणथी
प्रीति शा गुण तुज गाउं ?—प्रेमदा ! प्रीति करी पस्ताउं [14]

The खूटिसमस्या in *Saṃsārikā* is an address by a woman to her shy but ardent lover. The choice of the rhythm and

[10] The companion of joys and sorrows.

The tenderness of the mother and the affection of the father,—fuller and holier than either is the love of the wife.

Prosperity may come to-day and adversity to-morrow, but at all times the weak one shall prove the stronger and shall bear half the burden.

In this life one meets many foes, but if the ruler of the home is wise, that man's life is a success; even though poor, he is rich.

* * * * *

Even though burnt in the fire of tyranny or corroded by indifference this knot of love loosens not its grip.

[11] I love—and then I repent.

[12] I plunge in the hot ocean of love, but get bathed in a cold perspiration; O Love-bestower! I love—and then I repent.

[13] The ways of love are inscrutable: I try to lead, but am myself led away; O love-bestower! I love—and then I repent.

Yet love is a powerful enchantment, even though I am vanquished utterly, I am glad; O Love-bestower! I love—and then I repent.

[14] More sweet than life, more bitter than death, O Love! How shall I sing about thee? O Love-bestower! I love—and then I repent.

measure, no less than the language itself, thoroughly harmonises with the subject. A few verses may be quoted:

रस पातां रस पी ले
रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले,
रसबसतो आ वसंत बहार जो,
फूलफळादि खीले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले
* * * *

आव भ्रमर ! गुंजरव करतो !
कुंज कुंज तुं भमी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले.
रसिया लाडसघेली लाडोने
रोम रोम अहिं रमी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले.
* * * *

व्हेलो आव, पण जइश न व्हेलो,
हृदय सदैव वसी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले.
दे आलिंगन, मधुरुं चुंबन,
सुंदर अधर अमी ले ! रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले
ले ले लेतो जा, रसदाता !
दइ एकी, बेकी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले.
* * * *

मरवुं तो अमी पी मर मधुकर !
मरी झट फरी जनमी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातां रस पी ले.
अनायास आ सृष्टिसमस्या,
समज, चतुर ! समजी ले !—रसिकडा ! रस पातांरस पी ले.[15]

[15] Give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

This is the time for spring to bloom, when love overflows all nature, when flowers and fruits bloom forth. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

* * * * *

Come unto me, thou buzzing Bee ! wander at will from bower to bower. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

Beloved ! thy darling is mad for thee ; seek pleasure in every hair of mine. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

* * * * *

Silent love and hearts broken by separation are described in many poems, some of them full of deep pathos. In one place the poet wishes for the gift of forgetting the beloved so that his mind may be at rest. The whole philosophy of love is put in a few lines in the "Marriage-blessing" (लग्नाशिष):

सुख आशिष वरसाव, प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव.
महोबतना बांधेला जीवडा राखे तुं पर भाव,
प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव.
ए जोडां वच्चे, जगजीवन ! शुभ संबंध निभाव
प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव.
पति पत्नीना निकट धर्म तुं बन्नेने दर्शाव,
प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव
जे बेना हुं हाथ ज जोडुं, प्राण तुं प्रभु ! जोडाव
प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव.
ए महोबतने हुं अहिं नोधुं, तुं उपर नोंधाव,
प्रभु ! तुं सुख आशिष वरसाव.[16]

Come to me soon, but depart not soon, dwell for evermore in my heart. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

Clasp me within thy dear embrace, give me one sweet kiss as well, taste the sweet nectar upon my lips. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

Take them, take them, O Giver-of-Love, take all my kisses, take them away; for every once thou touchest my lips, twice on thy lips I fain would dwell. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

* * * * *

If thou must die, O Bee ! first taste the nectar sweet and then depart. And after thou hast passed away, hasten and come to me again. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

O Clever one ! this Crown of Life thou canst easily understand : understand it then. Beloved ! give me the wine of love to sip and sip it, too, thyself.

16 Marriage Blessing.

Shower down happiness and blessings; O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

May the two souls united in love be devoted unto Thee, O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

Between this couple, O Lord of the Universe ! maintain ever this holy bond; O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

Teach them both the mutual duties of husband and wife; O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

Quite in accord with this high conception of wedded life is his idea of childhood. The child to him is God manifest in human body, for he sees in every child the Child-Krishna, the Enchanter (मोहन) of all hearts:

शिशु ! आशिष मम ले ज्यां हो त्यां, गाउं कीर्ति मोहननी ।[17]

One of the finest of Malabari's poems is the Lullaby (हालरडुं) contained in his *Wilson-Viraha*. Some of its verses may be quoted, and quite appropriately it is to be sung to the measure of the well-known Gujarati song—माता जशोदा झुलावे पुत्र पारणे.[18]

झुले झुलोने रूपाला मारा लाडिला
जाया जनमथी जय जय जनुनी अंग;
शुभ ओच्छवनी वरणवुं शुं हुं लीला ?
जायो बेठो ज्यारे हसतो जनक उछंग.

*   *   *

हवे डहापणनी बनावुं रूडी घंटडी,
व्हालो वगाडी करे रे रणरणकार;
सुणी जीवडो ठरे माताकेरो बे घडो—
जेम मालो सुणी भ्रमरगुंजार.

*   *   *

आंखे काजळ लगाडुं रे विवेकनुं
नजर लगाडे नव जगन्मोह डाकेण;
पाप जाळमां फसे नव पुत्र जगमणी
मंतरी मंजन करूं तुज निर्मळ नेन.

I join merely their hands, do Thou, O Lord ! join their souls as well; O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

I register their love down below, do Thou register it above; O Lord ! shower down happiness and blessings.

17 O child ! wherever thou art my blessings go with thee; I sing the praises of the Enchanter. (From बचपणनो बलिहारी in the *Saṃsārikā*).

18 Mother Jaśoda rocks her Baby (Krishna) in the cradle.

निद्रा खोळे हवे सोंपुं मारा धोरीने,
पछी खोलीने हुं प्रभुभक्तिद्वार;
मानुं पाड प्रभु तारा कर जोडीने,
हुं सोवासणना फळया छे अवतार.[19]

The proverb says "still waters run deep", and so also did Malabari's friendships. He never was outwardly gushing or demonstrative, but when he chose a friend he clung to him through good and ill. And the dearest to him of all was Mr. Dayaram Gidumal. Mr. Dayaram has enshrined the memory of Malabari in his admirable life of the poet, and Malabari has in noble words given us a glimpse of what he felt for that comrade of his heart. Of all his poems perhaps this is the most truly autobiographical, we hear the heart of the poet beating in every line of अद्भुत मित्रभाव in the *Samsārikā*.

केम अने क्यारे मळयुं मन तारूं मारी साथ ?
दिल साथे दिल मळयुं, हाथ मळयो हाथशुं ?
बेना एक क्यारे अने केम बन्या नेक मित्र ?
तारा समावा ग्हेलां मारामां समात तुं ?
कोणथी कथाय एवी दैवी एकता स्वभाव ?
बेना एक थया ग्हेलां एकना बे थात शुं ?

19 Lullaby.

Rock in thy cradle, my pretty little darling; from his birth my little one has been the greatest pleasure of mother's heart. How can I describe the thrill of holy pleasure I feel, when they my darling seated on his father's lap smiles ?

* * * * *

I will get for him a little bell of wisdom and my darling will ring it—tinkle, tinkle hearing which mother's heart will be full of joy, just as the gardener rejoiceth at the buzzing of bees.

* * * * *

To his eyes I will apply the black powder of modesty, so that the witch of earthly attractions may not cast her evil eye upon him ; in order that my son may not be caught in the net of worldly sin, I will prepare a powder, and chanting a spell over it, will apply it to his clear eyes.

* * * * *

Now I will hand over my precious to sleep, and then opening wide the doors of devotion in my heart, I will with hands joined pour out thanks to the Lord, for fulfilling the yearnings of a happy wife.

हा, कशुं अशक्य नथी, सर्वशक्तिमान् ! तने
एकना बे करी बतलावे, जगतात ! तुं

एक धर्म, एक कर्म, एक अधिकार बेने,
एक किरतार, तारनार एक जोउं छुं ;
एक ज संसार, एक आचारविचार बेने
एक अहंकार—तारामां हुं मारो खोउं छूं ;
आवेश, उद्देश एक, विशेष कहुं शुं बीजुं ?
ऐक्य-अवलोकनमां चित्त चट्ट प्रोउं छूं ;
उमंग तरंगे उछळाइ, हुं समुद्र आंहिं.
शांत सुवदन तुं शशी उपर मोहुं छुं.

शो ए मित्रता ज ? जेमां जोई न जुदाइ कांई,
मलि ज मलाई, भाई ! तारीथी तणाउं छूं ;
त्राहि त्राहि जगत तवाईथी पोकारतो हुं,
आवी तारी शीतल छायातळे भराउं छुं ;
शांति शिखवी तुं निवृत्तिये मन शुद्ध करे ;
ए तारा अपार उपकार नित्य गाउं छुं ;
मित्रनुं चरित्र चित्र अल्प आ चितारि अत्र,
एकत्र संगाथ तुं बनी पवित्र थाउं छूं.

शा हुं तारा हृदयविस्तारना विचार करुं ?
केम वर्णवुं वीरा ! गांभिर्ये मुखारविन्दनुं ?
केम अने क्यारे तारे मारे प्रीतिपासो पड्यो,
हुं गुर्जर गुंजकार, तुं कमळ सिंधनुं ?
धन्य मित्रता ए, सगा भाईथी सवाई एवी ;
दयाराम मांहि देखुं दयामध्यबिन्दु हुं ;
ना, ना, ए भटाईथी सुगाई वा भराई जाय ?
तारामां शम्यो हुं तो, तूं पोते पण हूं ज छूं ![20]

[20] Wonderful Friendship.

When and how were thy mind and mine linked together, thy heart and mine, thy hand and mine? When and how did we two become one, O good friend? Couldst thou have

A great social reformer, who had spent himself all his life in the service of his sisters in India, might have been expected to write a lot of verse on the subject nearest his heart. But the poems on this subject are comparatively few in number and some are doubtless in imitation of the greatest Gujarati writer on the subject—Narmadāśankar. Though Malabari's heart was open to others' grief and though he always wept with others in distress, still the woes of the child-widow could not possibly have come home to him as they did to Narmadāśankar; and this emotional difference is clearly marked between the two poets.[21] There is certainly deep pathos and true sympathy in Malabari, but we must admit the superiority of the Hindu poet in this particular. The most pathetic of these poems is **एक पापी विधवानी अरज** from *Nīti-vinod*:

been first absorbed in me before I become absorbed in thee? Who could describe such natural union of tempers? Before we two were made one, was it not that one had been split into two? Ah, nothing is impossible to Thee, O Almighty, for Thou canst make two out of one, O Heavenly Father!

I see but one duty, one action, one aim for us both; one God and one Saviour one life and one mode of living and thinking for us both; and one individuality—thine, in which I have lost myself; one inspiration and one ideal; what more can I say? I get my mind entirely filled with thinking on our oneness, and like the ocean I toss up my waves of yearning towards my moon—thy serene face

O wonderous friendship! in which there never was any disparity. I am attracted, O my brother, by thy extreme goodness. When I am wearied completely by the worries of the world, I come and take shelter under thy cooling shade. Thou dost teach me to be calm and dost set my mind purified upon the highest paths. Such endless obligations of thine shall I ever sing aloud. I put down here this poor picture of my friend's virtues, and being united to thee I feel myself sanctified.

How shall I guage the depths of thy heart? How shall I describe the serenity of thy lotus face? How and when did that Gambler, Love, bring us together—I a bee of Gujarat and thou a lotus of Sindh? Praised be such friendship, exceeding by far even brotherly love, I see in Dayārām the very centre of *dayā* (love). Nay, but why dost thou, disdaining such flattering words hide thyself? I have been so entirely absorbed in thee that thou art my very self!

[21] As can be seen by comparing Narmadāśankar's आखिर दिन आव्यो आखर कैम न लाव्यो and Malabāri's विधवानो उद्गार. Narmadāśankar has recorded how copiously his tears flowed while he wrote his famous poem,

दूर करने प्रभु ! दुष्ट पापने नर्ककुंडथी नाथ उगार,
खरो तुं आधार ; कहूं कया बापने ?
* * * *

न्याय तारो नियमित पांसरो, सजा पाप प्रमाणमां थाय,
हैयुं हारी खाय; कहुं कया बापने ?
तोपण करुणातणा भर्या सागरो, दयादाननो दीपक दातार,
गरीब पाळनार ; कहूं कया बापने ?
* * * *

सोळ वरसे रंडापानुं दुःख दई, खुनीओए अपाव्यो वैराग्य,
खूंचवी सुखभाग ; कहुं कया बापने ?
स्वामी सरखानुं सुख सुकई जई; कादव माटी मळयां छे अथाग,
लाग्या बहु डाघ ; कहुं कया बापने ?
वेच्युं जोबन रही वश कामने, नहीं जाण्युं जवुं दरबार,
बोळयो अवतार ; कहुं कया बापने ?
दुःख हृदयनुं कह्युं में ब्हेरामने; मांगी लीधुं, अहो तारनार !
करो अंगीकार ; कहूं कया बापने ?[22]

The greater portion of Malabari's poetry may be classified as "moral and didactic". A very sharp satire runs through

[22] The cry of the fallen widow.

Remove, O God, this black stain ; save me, O Lord, from the pit of hell ; Thou art my only support : to which other Father may I complain ?

* * * * *

Thy Law is just and straight ; Thy punishment is proportionate to the fault ; still my heart misgives me : to which other Father may I complain ?

But Thou hast filled oceans with Thy compassion Thou art the glorious Bestower of pity and charity, Thou art the Father of the humble : to which other Father may I complain ?

* * * * *

At the age of sixteen they plunged me in the misery of widowhood and they heartlessly enforced on me renunciation of all pleasure, they took away from me all enjoyments : to which other Father may I complain ?

The waters of my wedded happiness have dried up and nothing but deep, deep mud remains, it has stained me all over : to which other Father may I complain ?

Yielding to passion I sold my womanhood ; I knew not I would have to undergo the Judgment, I ruined utterly my whole life : to which other Father may I complain ?

I have opened my afflicted heart to Behram (Malabari), and I pray earnestly, O my Saviour, take me once again into Thy Mercy : to which other Father may I complain ?

them all. He lays open the sores of public and social life in words that deal straight and hard-hitting blows at the evils described. This straight talk is possibly one of the causes why he never became really popular among those whose follies he thus mercilessly exposed. He was always impatient of the "little tyrants" invested with short-lived authority. Thus, he says of the petty police official of the village:

सत्ता तारी बळो सिपाईडा ! सत्ता तारो बळो.

*   *   *   *

ग्रामशांति प्हेले संहारे, सुखमां पेसी सळो
पछो रंक घसडे चोकोए, मांगो लांच नव मळो.[23]

Upon the flattering हजुरया (Courtier), too, his lash is well and truly laid, he calls him पेटे चालतो कोडो तु' पापो पेट पापथो भरे[24] and he ends up by saying that he would ultimately be smothered in his own filth and poison—वखत आवबे तु' पापो पण विष पोताने मरे.[25]

The गोसांइडा (the seeming Saint) and the बगला भगत (the Saintly Crane[26]), of which humanity has so many specimens, also get a few choice words from the poet. The former he consigns straight away to hell, for he says, गोसांइडा ! नरके तारो वास.[27] The latter is celebrated in a long poem, which deserves quoting.

भजो ले, बगला भगत ! पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !
श्वेत वस्त्र घालो, बनो साधु, बेसे तुं कंबो स्वगत !
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !

[23] May thy authority perish, O Officerling may thy authority perish.

*   *   *   *   *

You are the first to destroy the peace of the village, eating through its contentment like a canker; and then you drag the poor people to the court, if you do not get the bribe you demand.

[24] Thou art a wicked worm creeping on thy belly, filling it with thine own wickedness.

[25] When the time comes, O wicked one, thou, too, shalt be swallowed up by thine own slime.

[26] The crane stands apparently in meditation, but no fish capes him; hence he is the type of the hypocrite.

[27] O seeming Saint! thy dwelling is in hell.

संत साधुना साया हेठे लूंटे गामनी इजत;
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !
परमहंसशुं मौन धरे तुं ! फूंकी गांजो मधत;
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !
शुद्धी आवतां डहापण डहोले, पण नहि बोले मफत;
पात्र तुज भजो ले, बगला भगत !
* * * *
दूधमल बाळक जेवे म्होंडे, गटगट गळतो रगत;
पात्र तुज भजो ले, बगला भगत !
परमार्थनुं प्हेरण प्हेरोने, समस्त ठगतो जगत:
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !
मातपिता स्त्रीबाळक वेची, करवा निकळे तीरथ;
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत ![28]

But, the poet humorously remarks in the end,

पण बगला ! भूला मूर्खोने, त्हारी हशे कंई अगत;
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत !
माटे वदुं बगला ! बलिहारी, त्हारो ए आवशे वखत;
पात्र तुज भजी ले, बगला भगत ![29]

[28] Play thy part, O Saintly Crane! play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Dressed in white, with a pious face, how self-satisfied dost thou sit! Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Under the robes of the saint and the sage thou dost filch the honour of every one. Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Thou sittest silent (in meditation) like the holiest sage but not till thou art intoxicated with *gānjā*! Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

And when thy senses return, thou dost pretend to expound wisdom, but never dost thou speak without payment. Play thy part well, O Saintly Crane!

* * * * *

With a face like that of a suckling infant, thou quaffest deep draughts of blood! Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Putting on the robe of philanthropy, thou deceivest the whole world. Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

After selling thy father and mother, thy wife and children, thou goest forth on a pilgrimage.. Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

[29] But, O Crane, thou must needs be of some use to simple fools. Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Therefore, O Crane, I sing thy greatness. But even *thy* time (of reckoning) shall come. Play well thy part, O Saintly Crane!

Malabari's political views have not met with the approval of the modern Indian patriot. The reason is not far to seek. He is certainly not one who could be called "an extremist", in the sense the word bears at the present time. Perhaps he would not have been called even "a moderate". Politics had, in fact, no attraction for him as apart from his life's work of social reform. He was a firm believer in "England's mission in India". That would naturally be expected of him, for the greatest friends of his younger years,—the years of his early struggles against poverty—were two Englishmen, the Rev. Mr. Dixon of Surat and the large-hearted Dr. Wilson of Bombay. No man who has come into contact with a *true* Englishman can ever doubt that in very truth England and India have each message for the other and that their coming together is really the work of a Divine Providence. Malabari clearly saw one aspect of this mission, that of England to India. That he did not see the other side was due more to the education and the training of his times. How many of our older politicians have clearly voiced the mission of India to the world in general and to England in particular? But whether expressed in words or not, the feeling has always been with him that India must realise the full measure of her growth and of her true mission in the world. This seeming neglect of the other side has been Malabari's sin in the eyes of our modern young India. One need not agree with such a poem as **आपणा वडोलो आपणाथी मोटा?**[30] I myself do not. But that need not make us say that we have nothing whatever to learn from the West. And in justice to the poet we must admit that though he held up the greatness of England before our eyes as something greatly to be desired (as in **विलायतनां महत्वनां कारणो**[31]), still he explicitly states elsewhere (**पारकी हवेली जोइ पोतानी झुंपडी नहि तोडवी**[32]) that we should be careful not to

[30] Were our ancestors greater than ourselves?

[31] The causes of England's greatness.

[32] Do not demolish your own hut, on seeing your neighbour's palace.

lose what we have got already in trying to imitate the West too slavishly, and that we should not take up the vices of the West in the process of changing.

देशी नरनारी ! खरो सुधारो स्वीकारो समुदाय मळी
सौ अंग्रेजोना ढंग धरो तो भंग थशे आशा सघळी;
पासेनो पेली जोई हवेली निज झुंपडी तोडो तलपे
घरबार विनाना भार भूमिपर दोढचतुरमां नाम खपे.

* * * *

माटे देशीओ ! नकल करो ना सघळामां को एक प्रजा,
सौना गुणदोषो जोई तपासो, संघरवामां सरळ मझा.

देखादेखीना धरो दाखला, सारासार विचारीने
दुर्गुण संहारो, रहो सुधारे, सद्गुण सर्व स्वीकारीने,
जो वांदर पेरे टेव बोजानी, टेक विना तत्पर धरशो,
बहेराम कहेछे गर्थ गुमावी मोत विना रखडी मरशो [33]

As in all other matters he had a horror of mere lip-service. A true Zoroastrian, he tried to follow the main precept of his religion that action is the best for men. Mere words, unless translated into action, were utterly distasteful to Malabari's nature; he himself did not speak much, in fact he hardly spoke at all, but he worked hard all his life. And he never spared the lip-reformer, the person who turned back upon

[33] O my countrymen and countrywomen! Adopt true reform and work in unison for it. But if you will imitate all the ways of the English you shall surely be disappointed. If on seeing the palace of your neighbour you feel anxious to demolish your little hut, you would but wander about homeless on earth and you would be regarded only as clever fools.

* * * * *

Therefore, my countrymen! do not imitate any one nation in everything; for it is true wisdom to examine carefully the good and the bad in each, and then to adopt the good.

Scrutinise carefully the examples of blind imitation and weigh carefully the advantages and the disadvantages as well; drop the evil and continue in your progress by accepting all the good points. If you merely imitate, monkey-like, the customs of others without considering your self-respect, then, says Behram, you will lose your fortune and will be wiped off before your time.

his preached word, when the time came to put his words into practice. He says in the strongest language he can command :

बोल्युं पाळो रे देशियो ! नहितर बोलो न मिथ्या बोल
थूंक्युं चाटो श्वां द्विवेषियो ? पाळो आप्यो पवित्र ज कोल ;
भाषण भूंको रे मनभावतां, लांबा हाथ ने फरति डोक,
अवसर कामनो रे आवतां कायर न्हासो मूकी पोक

* * * * *

सुधारो समस्त रे क्यां थशे ? आगळ अग्रेसर नहि होय,
सैन्य आखुं शुं रे रणे धसे ? वीरजन धसे न पहेलो कोय [34]

His ideal for work he sums up in the last two lines of the same poem :

स्वधर्मने अर्पो रे प्राण सहु, एक बे दशनो शी विसात्,
सता थइ मरवे रे मान बहु, मनुष्यना देव बनो साक्षात्. [35]

And elsewhere in giving advice to his countrymen he says in unmistakable terms :

अतलग रहीने मतलब आप न काढता
एमां ते शा मार्या मोटा वाघ जो ?
शूरवीर ते जे हाम खरी देखाडता,
सुखमां पण दुःखमां शोधी भाग जो.

[34] O my countrymen ! keep your word, and if you cannot do so, much rather keep silent. O ye double-dealers, why do you retract your own words ? (Lit., why do you lick up your own spittle?) Keep your plighted troth, which is sacred. You bray out long sermons, with abundant gesture and head-wagging; but when the time comes for putting your words into practice, you run away like cowards.

* * * * *

How could there be complete reform if the leader is not the foremost ? How could an army rush to battle if the captain does not go at its head ?

[35] Consecrate your whole lives, all of you, to your own *dharma* (duty) ; what do one or two or ten lives matter ? There is great honour in dying for a great cause ; for thus you become veritable gods among men.

"सुधरो सुधरो" कह्ये सुधारो नहि थशे,
"सुधरो" कहेतां प्हेलां सुधरो आप जो ;
बालकाळ ते सुधारा विण तो वही जशे,
जो नहि सुधरो प्हेलां पोते बाप जो[36]

For his times and under the circumstances of his early training he has shown remarkable freedom of political thought. His critics among the younger generation would be doing but bare justice to his memory if they only remember these two points. The modern "extremist" would certainly not like his politics, but there have been few indeed who have spoken out with greater courage the truth regarding India's hopes. Let us also not forget the date when he published in his *Saṃsārikā* the two remarkable poems गुजरात नुं भावी गौरव and बाप मरे विन स्वर्ग न जाय, for it is the date that makes these poems all the more remarkable. Indeed, Mr. Giles, the Director of Public Instruction in Bombay, in a report on these poems said that Malabari was "seditious".[37] Malabari had the courage to fight out his own battle to the finish and came off victorious and with his reputation unsullied. His language was plain and honest, and he had preached pure patriotism; and if that were "seditious", there would be no safety for any public worker in India. These poems show the poet to have been a true prophet and a very clear-sighted person. In the former poem he begins by lamenting the state of his land :

सुण गरवी गुजरात ! वात कंइ कहुं हुं कानमां ;
समजु छे तुं सुजात, समजशे सहज सानमां
* * * *

[36] It is nothing very remarkable (lit. you have not slain any big tigers) that you remain aloof and do not serve your own ends. A true man is he who shows true spirit and takes his share of the pain as well as of the pleasure.

There will not be any reform by merely shouting, "reform, reform"; before you say, "reform", you should reform yourselves. The time for reforming the younger generation shall pass away, unless the fathers reform themselves first.

[37] The reasons for Mr. Giles' strange report were the Tilak trial and the Diamond Jubilee troubles in Poona at that time (1897).

छयासोलाख निज प्रजा, छतां वंझा रंडाणी,
आर्यपुत्री अनुपमा ! हिन्दसुन्दरी हिन्दवाणी.

* * * *

न मळे शौर्य उमंग, आर्य अभिमान शुं करे ?
देशदाझ वण पडी, पराधीन प्रजा पशु रे;
त्रण सैका वही गया, वश पडी रह्यो बीजाने,
जता आवता सर्व यवननी आण तुं माने.

हाय ! केम जीवाय पराधीन ए स्थितिमां ?
छुटी पडे अवतार गुलामी देखीतोमां ;
माडी ! उठ कर जोड, क्षमा मागी ले व्हेली,
कर्तव्ये पड व्हार, हिन्दमां सौथी प्हेली.[38]

Then rings out his clarion-call to his Motherland ;

रजपुतवीर जगाड, राज्यकर्ता कर साचा ,
ब्रह्मबाळ विद्वान, ज्ञान जिज्ञासु जाचा ;
देश देश वगडाव शंख तुज स्वाधीनतानो ,
बधे एकता भजव, पराजय करो भिन्नतानो .

पिटव दांडी परमार्थ. स्वार्थ संहारो, माडी !
सुधरे पुत्र परिवार, परस्पर प्रीते घाडी ;
उतरे पनोती हवां, वखत आवे छे सारा ,
तत्पर था गुजरात ! हक्क भोगववा तारा [39]

[38] Listen, O noble Gujarat, I will whisper something into thine ear. Thou art sensible and well-born, and thou shalt understand the matter in one word.

* * * * *

Thou art widowed and childless, even with thy people numbering eighty-six lakhs, O daughter of the Āryas ! unequalled among the beauties of Hind,

* * * * *

If there is no valour and no enterprise, what shall Āryan pride then avail ? Thy people are living like tame cattle in dependence on the foreigner, without thought of their country. Three centuries have passed and thou hast remained a slave to the foreigner ; thou hast accepted the mastery of every barbarian (*yavana*) that has come along.

Alas ! how canst thou live in this state of dependence ? Life itself would depart, oppressed by this state of slavery. O Mother ! arise, fold thy hands and quickly ask for forgiveness ; come forth in action, the first in all Hind.

[39] Awaken the Rajput heroes, make thy Princes true to themselves ; make thy Brāhmaṇa youth learned and seeking after true wisdom. In every land cause the

At the end the poet regrets that he would not live to see the day when his beloved Gujarat would be a land of the free and of a great people. He writes here words of passionate love for his land, equalled by few poets, surpassed by none:

पूर्व जन्मनां पाप नर्मदाजळ[40] शुद्ध करशे,
नवीन जन्म शूरवीरथकी ए खोळो भरशे;
हूं क्यां जोवा रहुं नवीन ए जन्मज तारो,
माता दुःख मुझवणे गाळी नांख्यो जन्मारो.

हशे; न मुज मन दुःख, विशेष एह विषेनुं;
अर्पि दउं सो जन्म, एवडुं, मा! तुज ल्हेणुं;
सो आपुं लइ एक, सहस्र आपुं हुं एके,
गुर्जर देश फरी जोउं दीपतो सत्य विवेके.[41]

The other poem—आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय—is even more remarkable. It may have been a prophecy of all the political evolution of India even up to the present day.

धर्म धुरंधर बन्धु आर्य! केम थतां नहि इच्छित कार्य?
पड्यो केम मरवा निजदेश? मृत्युदशा के निद्रावेष?
ऊठो, जुओ, छे कारण क्यांय?-आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय.

ऊठो, वीर, फ्हेलो ए धर्म, देशोदयनां करवां कर्म;
करो प्रजा स्वतन्त्र तमाम, हाथे हुन्नर, हैडे हाम;
तोज देशदारिद्र टळाय; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय.

clarion-call of thy independence to be sounded; bring about unity everywhere and defeat the demon of disunion.

Cut off self-seeking, O Mother! and proclaim the ideal of self-sacrifice, may thy sons and daughters start their lives anew close united in bonds of love. Thy evil stars are now setting, and happier days are dawning; get ready, O Gujarat, to enjoy thy birth-right.

[40] Referring to the Paurānic prophecy that when the Gangā loses her sanctity the Narmadā shall take her place as the holiest stream of India.

[41] The waters of the Narmadā shall cleanse the sins of thy past and in a fresh existence shall fill thy lap with a new race of heroes. Shall I live to see this new birth of thine? But I have wasted myself away worrying over the griefs of my mother.

Let that be; I grieve not about this matter. I would give up a hundred lives for thee, so great, O Mother, has been the debt I owe thee. I would give a hundred lives, yea, even a thousand, for a single life when I could see the land of Gujrat flourishing once again with true and noble ideals.

खिलवो हुन्नर ने वेपार, खेती ने वळी खनिज प्रकार ;
काच, कोलसा, लोखंडकाम, खोदो खाणो ठामेठाम ;
खनिज हाल कंचन लेखाय; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय

* * * *

कागळ, शण, सुतळी, कापुस, बासण माटीनां दिलखुश ;
एवी सेंकडो वस्तु आज, आवे दूरथी आपणे काज ;
आ ते शां कौतुक कहेवाय ? आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

घर आंगणे वस्तु ए सहु, साहस विण सबडे छे बहु ,
पाणी मूले घसडाई जाय, यूरोप आदि खंडो मांय ;
त्यां तेनां रूपान्तर थाय; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

जुवो अंगत ने घर संसार, खपनी चीजो विविध प्रकार ;
एमांनी बहु मोटो भाग, आवे ब्हारथकी जल माग ;[42]
एक तणा दश वीश अपाय; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

बीजा हाथ पर हुन्नर कळा, ए पण परदेशोनी बला ;
ज्ञान, सान ने शिक्षण वळी, विदेशथी आवे निकळी ;
हिन्द पराधीन मारे हाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

थोडामां थोडुं राज अमल, बहुभागे तमने नहि सफळ ;
लखो रुपैया रोज पगार, परदेशी गजवां मोझार ;
रूपारेल आ पेर तणाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

देशतणी आ शी अवदशा ? सोए जाय कंई नेवुं कसा ;
पराधीनता निर्धनताय, शो अंतर छे ए बेमांय ?
क्यां तक दारुण दुःख खमाय ? आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

वळी बीजी नुकसानी घणो अटकावा शक्ति आपणी ;
केळवणीनो करो प्रसार, कहो प्रजाने निकळा ब्हार ;
आबादीना मार्ग घणाय ! आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

[42] माग=मार्ग.

एकनुं धन बीजानो श्रम, बे मळी वधवामां न विलंब ;
बे बांधवनो केवो संप ? प्रजा मात्रना मनने जंप ;
स्वराज्य तो एमज सोहाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

साचुं कहुं अंग्रेज प्रजा, ए माटे नहि करशे सजा ;
हिन्द प्रजा मळी को पण दिये,[43] जो पोतानुं भोगवी लिये ;
इङ्गलंडने मन अतिसुख थाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

ए शुभ दिन क्यारे आवशे ? क्यारे सहु संपीला थशे ?
स्वराज्य बीडुं झडपे क्यार ? उदय थाय तो थायज त्यार ;
बाकी सहु वलखांज मराय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

गमे एवी छाया पारकी, सुख साचुं एमां तो नथी ;
अणसमजण के बेविश्वास—एनो एमां रहेशे भास ;
पोतानुं सत्वर समजाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

पण आ सुख मेळववुं होय, जाति श्रम वण हसतो रोय ;
पराई आश सदा निराश, अन्ते निष्फळ ने अविकास ;
धाय धाय पण त्यांनो त्यांय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

विलायते नरवीरो घणा, करे सहाय न राखे मणा ;
धन एवा दाता परगजु, नित्य नाम एना हुं मजुं ;
पण तेथी मुज तारण थाय ? आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .

उठो आर्यजन जागो हवां, ऊमां कार्य तम हाथज थवां ;
बनी मरणियां भीडो बाथ, अन्त सुधी बीजो शो साथ ?
आप समान न अन्य सहाय ; आप मरे बिन स्वर्ग न जाय .[44]

[43] दिये=दिवसे.

[44] O my deeply religious brother Ārya! why can we not get what we wish? Why has our country been as it were on the death-bed? Is this the approach of death or only sleep? Awake and find out what is the cause; for without self-help nothing could be done.

Arise, O heroes! our first duty is to work for the uplift of our land. Make all our people free: give them industry for their hands and courage for their hearts. Only thus the poverty of our land could be banished; for without self-help nothing could be done.

Develop your industries and commerce, agriculture and mining; also glass, coal and iron industries; open up mines everywhere, for minerals are today the best wealth; and without self-help nothing could be done. * * * *

No better admonition would young India need from the veteran worker. He not merely sang of the future glories of his land but he worked hard all his life to bring these glories nearer. His महामन्त्र (Great Word) was काम करो जो काम. In a

Paper, jute, string, cotton and fine porcelain-ware, hundreds of such articles come for us from far-off lands. What a sad sight is this? Without self-help nothing could be done.

All raw materials for these things are to be got at our very thresholds; but without enterprise they are lying useless. They are dragged away, at insignificant prices, to Europe and other lands; there they are manufactured into useful shapes. Without self-help nothing could be done.

* * * * *

Behold, there are various aricles of daily use in the household. Of these a very large portion comes for our use from across the seas; and we have to pay prices ten and even twenty-fold. Without self-help nothing could be done.

On the other hand even the arts and industries that we have already got here, are the evil importations of the foreigner. Our knowledge, science and education, all have come from foreign lands. India dependent on others sighs with grief; for without self-help nothing could be done.

To make matters worse, the government is not kindly to us for the most part. With salaries amounting to lakhs of rupees daily the foreigners fill their pockets satisfactorily; this is the silver-drain from our land: without self-help nothing could be done.

How great is the misery of our land? We have to give away about ninety per cent. of our wealth. Dependence on others and poverty—what is the difference between these two. How long shall we consent to live in such misery? Without self-help nothing could be done.

* * * *

We have the power to put a stop to many such losses. Encourage the spread of learning and teach the people to come forward. There are many ways to prosperity; but without self-help nothing could be done.

One gives his wealth, the other his labour; when these two are united advancement comes apace. These two brothers (capital and labour) being united the whole nation would be at ease. Such co-operation alone can lead to self-rule; without self-help nothing could be done.

In very truth the English nation would not be sorry if some day the Indian people united together would manage their own affairs; England would be very pleased indeed;—but without self-help nothing could be done.

When will dawn that happy day? When shall we all be united? When shall we start on our way to *Svarāj*? Then and only then shall we rise. All effort else is useless struggling; for without self-help nothing could be done.

However good it may be there is no true happiness under foreign protection; there will always be occasions either for misunderstanding and want of confidence. We alone can understand our own people best; and without self-help nothing could be done.

But if we want to get this happiness, without our own exertion we will not succeed. Expectation from another always results in disappointment, for in the end there is no result and no progress; and though we may seemingly progress we would always be in the same place; for without self-help nothing could be done.

poem of that name in the *Anubhavikā* he exhorts each race of India in turn :

काम करोजी काम जगतमां काम ज सुख मुद्दाम ;
काम ज भक्ति, काम ज मुक्ति काम स्वर्ग विश्राम ; जगतमां.
काम ज गङ्गा काम ज यमुना, काशीमथुराधाम ; जगतमां.
काम ज मक्का, काम ज मदिना, काम ज यरुसलाम ; जगतमां.
काम ज खुरशेद, काम ज अरद्विसूर, काम ज आतशबहेराम ;[45] जगतमां.[46]

There are some poems which might be termed autobiographical. They give us an insight into his inmost beliefs and into the true springs of his heart which inspired all his actions. In the first place he had the firmest faith in God and considered himself a devoted worshipper of the Giver of all Blessings. He never for a moment forgot his God. In one place he says in his *Nīti-vinod.*

को पण कार्य ज आरंभ करतां भक्तिनो धूप देवोजी ,
जो ते कार्य सफल करवुं तो नाथनाम मुख लेवो .[47]

His prayers in verse breathe a spirit of deep devotion to God as "our shelter from the stormy blast". In the fine poem श्रीहरिशरण he says :

शरणे जा श्रीहरि समजो मन ! शरणे जा श्रीहरि !

In England there are many great men who would give us unstinting help. All honour to such philanthropists; I always bless their names. But could that lead to *our* salvation? Without self-help nothing could be done.

* * * * *

Arise, therefore, O Āryan people, *now*, there are tasks to be done by *our* hands alone. Engage in the task and be true unto death, what greater ideal could accompany us through life. There is no help like self; without self-help nothing could be done.

[45] These three objects, the Sun the Ocean and the Holy Fire, are venerated by the Parsis as symbols of the Deity.

[46] Act, act, in this world, for action alone is true happiness.
Action is prayer, action is salvation, action is rest in heaven; act, act in this world.
Action is Ganga, action is Yamuna, action is Kasi-Mathura; act, act in this world.
Action is Mecca, action is Medina, action is Jerusalem; act, act in this world.
Action is the Sun, action is the Ocean, action in the Holy Fire; act, act in this world.

[47] Before beginning any undertaking, we should burn the incense of devotion: if we desire the undertaking to be successful we should take the name of the Lord upon our lips.

हरि दु:खहरता शान्ति करता, प्रीति हरिनी ज नरी—समजी मन!
* * * *

जा शरणे ए दयासिन्धुने पी अमी तृष्णा मरी—समजी मन!
हरिगुणमाळा हृदय विंटाळी, मुखे नाम शुभ धरी—समजी मन!
* * * *

जा, जा, जीव! जमथी ना ब्हीतो, हरीमां शमी जीव मरी—समजी मन![48]

And among his Hindi poems is an exquisite gem—perhaps the best he ever wrote. It is found in the *Saṃsārikā* and is entitled कायाक्लेश:.

मैं तो रो रही रे मैं तो रो रही रे
प्रभूप्रीत विमुख सब खो रही रे—मैं तो.
जन्मते ही रोई, सखी, मरतेमी रोऊं;
सारी उमर भई, सो रही रे—मैं तो.
कबि कबि जागी अंधो पतंग सरीखो;
जूठे जगदीपपे मोह रही रे—मैं तो.
आश तजी ही बिसवास बूडायो;
होनेवाली अब हो रही रे—मैं तो.
याद आते अखियां बहे आंसु;
हरी चरण इन आंसुसे धो रही रे—मैं तो.[49]

[48] O mind, be wise and take refuge in Śrī Hari, take refuge in Śrī Hari.

Hari takes away our troubles, Hari giveth peace, the love of Hari alone is unalloyed.

Fly for refuge to this Ocean of Compassion and drink of His nectar till thy thirst be quenched.

Put the rosary of Hari's praises round thy heart and have His Holy Name upon thy lips.

Go on, my soul! be not afraid of Death: absorbed in Hari, though dying, thou shalt yet live.

[49] I am weeping, I am weeping, for I have lost all the immortal nectar of the Lord's love.

I wept when I was born, O friend, I shall weep even when I die; I have slept my whole life through.

Sometimes I awoke, but, like a blind moth, I was attracted by the false glow of the world.

I have lost all hope, for I have betrayed the trust—what was to happen has already happened.

When I remember all this, my eyes overflow, and with my tears I wash the feet of Hari.

As already mentioned, Malabari was a silent man. In fact he made almost a religion of silence. He has written fine poem on the "Pleasures of Silence" (मौननी मझा) in the *Saṃsārikā* which is really delightful in its quaint, though deeply philosophical conceit. It gives us some idea of Malabari's inner nature, which intensely disliked all manner of useless chatter. The deepest visions of life come only when the outward clamour is silenced.

मौन ! सुमुक्ति द्वार, अमरता साधन पूरुं ;
शुभ आयु शणगार, मोत संहारक शूरुं ;
मनुष्यदेह संस्कार, देव कीर्ति कीर्तन तुं
सरस्वती संतान, सदाशिव प्रबळ रतन तुं .

मौन ! विष्णुनो शंख, कला कौशल नारद तुं ;
राज्यपद्धति विषे प्रमाण तुं उंचा पदनुं ;
स्वर्गवाणी तुं, मौन ! वीर, ऋषि, मुनिनी भाषा ,
वाक्यचातुरी पूरी, आशाहीनकेरी आशा .

अंधानी अहो आंख, कान ब्हेराना साचा ;
कर लुलाना कुशळ, विमळ मुंगानी वाचा .
भिन्न भिन्न सुप्रकार, मौन निवृत्ति केरूं ;
प्रवृत्तिनुं पण मौन, चित्त चिदूघनथी घेरूं .

श्मशाननुं छे मौन, मौन संसार तणुं रे ;
मौन समाधि विषे, अवस्था श्रेष्ठ गणुं रे .
जे स्थितिमां हुं होउं, मौन तुज खोळो मागुं ;
करी अभिवंदन मनन देवनुं चिन्ता त्यागुं .[50]

[50] O Silence! thou art the door to salvation, and the best means for attaining immortality. Thou art the best jewel of one's life, and the valiant conqueror of Death. Thou art the highest good of mankind and the glorious chant of the victory of the Gods, Thou art the child of Sarasvati, the powerful jewel of Śiva.

O Silence! thou art the conch of Vishnu, thou art the art and craft of Nārada. In courts of kings thou art the passport to high eminence. O Silence! thou art the voice of Heaven; O great one, thou art the speech of sages and saints. Thou art the highest eloquence and the hope of those deprived of hope.

This silence about himself which he observed through life, gave rise to a great deal of misunderstanding among the public regarding his true character. All sorts of probable and improbable motives were attributed to him. He tells us about these in a poem in the *Saṃsārikā* called भरम भारि (the Great Secret) with the refrain बांधि मूठि लाख बराबर—a precept to which he adhered to such an extent that he remained an inscrutable mystery even to his intimate associates. The poem is a real bit of autobiography, for everything put down here had actually been said of him while living and even after he had passed away.

कोई कहे एतो गर्मकवि, अने कोई कहे अति विद्वान ;
आत्मज्ञानी कही कोई बोलावे, कोई कहे मूढ नादान ;
कोई कहे स्थिर ने शांत मनोवृत्ति, कोई कहे के सौ अभिमान ;
कोई कहे शूगो, कोई कहे कायर, कायानुं क्यां मान ?
कोई कहे दाता, कोई कहे भिक्षुक, कोई कहे ममति माख ;
बांधो मूठी लाख बराबर, भरम ! शरम मुज राख .

कोई कहे ऋषि, मुनि, योगी, विरलो, वानप्रस्थ विशुद्ध ;
कोई कहे रोगी, भोगी भमरो, करे प्रजाशुं युद्ध ;
कोई कहे ब्राह्मण, कोई कहे क्षत्रिय, – पारसीनो तो वेश ;[51]
कोई कहे देशो छेज नहीं रे, एनुं दिल परदेश ;
कोई कहे आस्तिक, कोई वळी नास्तिक, भिन्न मत ने भिन्न माख ;
बांधी मूठी लाख बराबर, भरम ! शरम मुज राख .

Thou art the eyes of the blind and the truthful ears of the deaf, the nimble limbs of the limbless and the clear speech of the dumb. Varied and exalted is the Silence on the Path to God, and the Silence of Nature's unfolding, too, is deeper than the deepest philosophy.

There is a Silence of the burning-ground, and a Silence in this worldly life. And the Silence of divine meditation I regard the highest of all states. In whatever circumstances I be placed, O Silence, I desire to rest in thy lap, I bow to thee, I think of thee, the Deity, and am free from all anxiety.

[51] This refers to a rumour current about the poet's early works, that he had them written by a Hindu and passed them off as his own.

जगव्याख्या छे अवळी सवळी, कोने पूछवा जाउं ?
एक धोळुं तो बीजुं काळुं एमज हुं परखाउं;
जनकथनी जो सत्य होय तो करुं तेनो ज स्वीकार,
स्वभाव रुचतुं सर्वे बोले एवो आ संसार;
राजी हजार पांच पचीशे, जन व्याख्या दे लाख—
बांधी मूठी लाख बराबर, भरम ! शरम मुज राख.[52]

It may, however, be noted that even here he does not give out his secret and at the end we are just where we were! His prayer—भरम ! शरम मुज राख—was granted and to the end of his life his deepest concerns were known practically to himself alone, except in those occasional glimpses of himself he gives us in his writings.

Another fine bit of autobiography is contained in the poem मा दुनियाना उपकार from the only collection of poems which he wrote in the "Parsi dialect". He recalls in that poem that he has been instrumental by the grace of God in helping the poor and needy;

गरज ने गुनाहना घणा एवा भोग
जे हमदिली मारीना लइ चुक्या लाभ;
गमे एवा म्होताज, गमे एवा रोग—
नीचे जेने धरती नहि, उपर न आभ—

[52] Some say "he is a born poet", and some say "he is very wise", some call me a deep philosopher, and some an inexperienced fool; some say "he is a steady and grave person", and some say "all is pride"; some call me a hero, and some a coward who does not know himself; some say "he gives freely" and some say "he is a beggar" and some, "he is a fickle moth": the closed fist is said to be worth a lakh; O Mystery, keep thou my secret safe.

Some call me a Ṛṣi, a sage, a holy saint retired from life, and others call me a diseased, profligate wanderer, an enemy of the people; some say he is a Brāhmaṇa, some a Kṣatriya, the Parsi name being only a disguise; while some say, "he is not an Indian at all; his heart is in foreign lands", some call me a theist, some an atheist; thus there are different opinions differently expressed; but the closed fist is said to be worth a lakh; O Mystery, keep thou my secret safe.

The opinion of the world is changing and unstable, whom then should I ask? I am known to some as white, to others as black. If the talk of the people were correct, I would accept it gladly, but the world is such that each one speaks according to his nature. I would be glad to possess a few thousands, but rumour says I have lakhs; the closed fist is said to be worth a lakh; O Mystery, keep thou my secret safe.

मैं तेवांनी सेवा बी कीधी सिताब
बशारतथी तारी, अए परवरदिगार !
न चाह्यो कंई बदलो, न चाह्युं सवाब,
थयुं तारी बरकतथी हतुं जे थनार.[53]

But, he says, from those who benefited through him he got in return only base ingratitude. Those whom worldly position has not spoilt, those alone show gratitude;

जो एहसान हो तो गरीबोमां होय—
जे मतलबना पूरा न पाम्या सवाद.[54]

But he had the true satisfaction in knowing that his duty was done. The last eight lines of this poem sum up the whole of his philosophy of life; and these are engraved on his tomb-stone at Simla, where his body lies in the midst of some of Nature's grandest scenery—just a position he may have liked to have for his last resting place:

फरज जो अदा मैं कीधी हो, खुदा !
गरज बीजी शी !–एक फाटी चदर—
न उपकार कोनो न कोनी अदा—
मले चार गजनी जो सादी कबर,
नमामी छूपी कोई बियाबानमां,
के परवतनी ढलती तळेटी उपर;
गमे कोतरे, तुज खुद मानमां,
फकत बेज बोलो—इलाही शुकर.[55]

[53] Many were the victims of need and of sin, who had taken advantage of my kindness. However needy, however diseased they might have been even such as had no refuge on earth or in heaven, I had rendered them help swiftly, at Thy command, O Lord; I never desired any reward for this nor yearned for heaven; whatever I did was through Thy grace.

[54] If there is gratitude at all it is only among the poor, who have not yet had the chance of getting a taste of self-seeking.

[55] If, O God, I have done my duty, what other wish can I have, but for a torn winding-sheet? What care I for the favours I have granted or for thanks due to me, if I get a plain grave a couple of yards in extent, nameless and hidden in some untrodden wilderness without a name, or on the sloping side of a mountain; there might be engraven on it (but only for Thy glory) these two words only—"Thank God".

NOUN DECLENSION IN THE BAUDDHA-GĀN.*

BY

MUHAMMAD SHAHIDULLAH, M.A., B.L.,

Lecturer in Bengali, University of Dacca.

The Sāhitya Pariṣat of Calcutta has published a collection of Buddhist Works in a volume under the name of *Bauddha Gān o Dohā*. These works were discovered in Nepal by MM. Haraprasad Śāstrī, C.I.E., in 1897-98 and 1907 and have been edited by him for the Vangīya Sāhitya Pariṣat (series No. 55). The volume consists of four works :

1. *Caryācarya-viniścaya* by various authors,[1]
2. *Dohā-koṣa* by Saroja Vajra,
3. *Dohā-koṣa* by Kṛṣṇācāryapāda or Kāṇha

and 4. *Ḍākārṇava* by an unknown author.

These works are said to have been composed between 8th and 12th centuries. The dates of the manuscripts, however, have not been mentioned.

A little examination will show that the language of the *Caryācarya-viniścaya* is different from that of the other works

* The following abbreviations among others are used in this essay—

Ap.	... Apabhraṁśa	*Or.*	... Oṛiyā
As.	... Assamese	*O.* with *Hin.* &c.	Old (I use *Old* as distinguished from *Modern*)
Beng.	... Bengali		
Bi.	... Bihārī	*Panj.*	... Panjābī
E. Hin.	... Eastern Hindī	*Pkt.*	... Prākrit
Guj.	... Gujrātī	*Skt.*	... Sanskrit
Hin.	... Hindī	*Sin.*	... Sindhī
Mar.	... Marāṭhī	*W. Hin.*	... Western Hindī
Nep.	... Nepālī	*ŚKK.*	... *Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan*
		V. S.	... *Vaṅga Sāhitya Paricaya.*

[1] The proper name of this book seems to have been *Āścarya-caryācaya.*

of the volume. This work being a collection of popular Buddhist songs, it is natural that it should use the language of the time. The other works are in a language very near the Apabhraṁśa of the Prakrit grammarians which might have been the book language of the time. A closer analysis of the songs will reveal dialectical differences among them, which can well be expected in a work containing the writings of twenty-two authors, some coming from different parts of the country and some living in different times. Nevertheless the songs may be said to be practically in the same language. Its main differentia from the language of the rest of the volumes is the locative in -ऍँ, -एरे -त, the genetive in -एर, -एरे, -रे, -एरि, -र and the past tense in -इल, -एल, the past absolutive in -इले and the future in -इब. All these unmistakably bring the language of the *Caryācarya-viniścaya*, or *Bauddha Gān* as the learned editor calls it, within the category of the Indo-Aryan Vernaculars, especially of the group called the East Gauḍian or the East Indo-Aryan, which consists of Oriya, Behari, Bengali and Assamese. It is this fact which makes the *Bauddha Gān* so interesting to a student of Modern Indo-Aryan Philology. Before making any sweeping assertion that this language represents the earlier phase of Bengali or any of the particular Vernaculars or that it is the prototype of a whole group, it is necessary to examine the grammar of the *Bauddha Gān* in detail. I shall confine my attempts to only a portion of it in this paper.

THE CASES.

Nominative Case.

No case ending (general):

काआ तरुवर पञ्च वि डाल । (लुइ) p. 1.

शाखा तरुवर मौलिल रे । (शबर) p. 43.

नाद न विन्दु न रवि न शशिमण्डल ।
चिअराअ सहावे मुकुल । (सरह) p. 49.
मन तरु पाञ्च इन्दि तसु साहा । (काह्नु) p. 68, etc.

This is also the case with Māgadhī Pkt.[2] (optionally), Ap.[3], Beng., Or., Bi., As., Panj., Hin., and other Indo-Aryan vernaculars excepting Sindhī.

Case ending in उ (very rare) :

तुला धुणि धुणि आँसु रे आँसु
आँसु धुणि धुणि निरवर सेसु ॥ (शान्ति) p. 41.
तँइ लो डोम्बी सअल विटलिउ । (कण्ह) p. 32, etc.

This is found also in Ap.[4] and in O. Maithilī, *e.g.*

फनिपति नहि मोरा मुकुता हारु । Vidyāpati, p. 45,

and also in O. Mar., O. Hin., O. Pan., and Sin.[5] The उ has remained in the following Bengali words in a stereotyped form : यादु, बाबु, कानु.

Case ending in आ :

सुसुरा निद गेल । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5.
आपना मांसेँ हरिणा वैरी ॥ (भुसुकु) p. 12.
मातेल चौष-गअन्दा धावइ । (महीधर) p. 29, etc.

Ap., O. Bi., O. Beng., have the same case ending; Compare :

कनकलता अवलिन्दा
दमना माझ उगल जनि चन्दा । Vidyapati, p. 21.
राम काजे हनुमन्ता ।
तेहेन आग्यार दूता ॥ SKK. p. 26.
नरा गजा विंशे श्रय । Bengali proverb.

[2] Var. XI. 10.
[3] Hem. IV. 344.
[4] Hem. IV. 331
[5] Hoernle, p. 188 ; Beames, Vol. II, p. 215.

Case ending in ए :

एखेर तेन्तलि कुम्भीरे खाअ । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5.

काह्ने गाइ तु काम चण्डाली । (काह्न) p. 32.

वाजुले दिल मोहकखु भणिआ । (भादे) p. 54.

It is also found in Māgadhī Prakrit,[6] and Ardha Māgadhī.[7]

And also in O. Bi., *e.g.*

दह दिह भेल उजोरे । Vidyāpati, p. 25.

भणे कवि कण्ठहारे । Do. p. 48.

Modern and O. As., *e.g.*

पुछिलन वार्त्ता पाछे ऋषि भरद्वाज । *Rāmāyaṇa* by Sankar Deva, p. 158.

ब्रह्माहरे करे यार चरणे वन्दन । Do., p. 1.

Modern and O. Beng.

धल काल हुइ केश दिल नारायणे । SKK. p. 1.

अष्टम गर्भे हइव देव नारायणे । Do. p. 3.

लोके वले । etc.

This is also found in O. Or., *e.g.*

आचारे पाणी धोइला (Insc. of Vīra Nāra Siṁha Deva, *J. A. S. B.*, 1924, p. 43, etc.)

This also occurs in Prakṛta-Piṅgala-Sūtra, *e.g.*

भण मल्लिवरे (p. 70, Bombay Ed.), भण सुकइवरे (p. 95), etc.

Case ending in एँ :

अइसा चर्य्या कुक्कुरी पाएँ गाइड़ । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5.

अलिएँ कालिएँ वाट रुन्धेला । (काह्न) p. 4.

आजदेवेँ सअल विहरिउ । (आर्य्यदेव) p. 48.

The same case ending occurs in Old Beng., *e.g.*

सवदेवेँ मेलि सभा पातिल आकाशे SKK. p. 14.

पुरुव कालत ऋषिएँ बुइल । Do., p. 42.

[6] Var. XI. 10; Hem. IV. 287.

[7] Hem. IV. 287.

Case ending in ओ (very rare) :

जीवन्ते मअलें णाहि विशेसो । (सरह) p. 38.

उमत सवरो पागल शवरो । (शवर) p. 43.

This is found also in Prakrit,[8] and Apabhraṁśa,[9] Mārwārī, Guj., Sin. and Np. have ओ for आ of Hin., Panj. etc., *e.g.* भलो for H. भाला, घोड़ो for H. घोड़ा. The ओ ending of some Beng. adj. is derived from अ due to the harmonic sequence of vowels and so it is not a survival of the old case ending.[10]

OBJECTIVE CASE.

No case ending (general) :

लुइ भणइ गुरु पुच्छिअ जाण । (लूइ) p. 1.

This is also the case with Ap.[11], Beng., Or., Bi., As., Hin., Mar., Panj.[12].

Case ending in इ :

गअणाह जिम उजोलि चान्दे । (भुसुकु) p. 47.

खनह न छाड़अ भुसु अहेरि । Do., p. 36.

Cf. Mg. Pkt. gen.[13] आह, Ap. gen.[14] हो, O. W. Hin. gen. acc.[15] ह.

Case ending in आ :

मार रे जोइआ मुसा पवणा । (भुसुकु) p. 36.

छाड़ु छाड़ माआ मोहा । (शवर) p. 98.

This is found also in O. Bi., *e.g.*

वन्दह नन्द किशोरा । Vidyāpati, p. 11.

and Apabhraṁśa.[16]

[8] Var. V. 1 ; Hem. III. 2.

[9] Hem. IV. 332.

[10] Hoernle, p. 188, 38.

[11] Hem. IV. 344.

[12] Beames, Vol. II, pp. 252, 253.

[13] Var. XI. 12 ; Hem. IV. 299

[14] Hem. IV. 338.

[15] Hoernle, pp. 206, 207.

[16] Hem. IV. 300.

Case ending in क :

तिशरण णावी किअ अठक मारी । (काह्न) p. 24.

मतिएँ ठाकुरक परिनिविता । Do., p. 22.

This also occurs in O. Bi., *e.g.*

कओनक कइव मेदिनि से थोल । Vidyāpati, p. 46.

Old Bengali, *e.g.*

प्रथमत कंशे पूतनाक नियोजिल ।

तन पान छले काह्न ताक संहारल ॥ SKK. p. 5.

सिंहक देखिया येन शृगाले पलाय । V. S. Pt. I, p. 618.

नृपतिक रचिया थाकिव सकल । Do., p. 633.

उत्तरक करिल आश्वास वचन । Do., p. 701.

This is also the case with Assamese.

This क has been preserved in the Northern Dialect of Bengali.[17]

Cf. Hin. को, Or. कु, Old Panj. को, कू.[18]

Case ending in के :

केडुआल नाहि कें कि वाहवके पारअ

Cf. Bengali के, E. Hindi के, Sin. खे.[19] The same case ending is found in O. Bi., *e.g.*

एकक हृदय अओके न पाओल । Vidyāpati, p. 48.

पियाकें लिखिए पाठाउवि पाती । Do., p. 174.

INSTRUMENTAL CASE.

Case ending in एँ (general) :

भवनइ गहण गम्भीर वेगें वाही । p. 11.

अपना मांसें हरिणा वैरी । (भुसुकु) p. 12.

सदगुरु वोहें जितिल भववल । (काह्न) p. 22.

[17] Grierson, Vol. VI. p. 164.

[18] Beames, Vol. II. p. 253, Hoernle, p. 223.

[19] Beames, Vol. II. p. 253, Hoernle, p. 223.

This also occurs in Ap.[20], Mar.[21], Old Bi., *e.g.*

जनि सुधाकर करें कवलित अमिय वम चकोरा। Vidyāpati, p. 50.

एहनि सुन्दरी गुणक आगरि पुनें पुनमत पाव। Do., p. 74.

Old Ben., *e.g.*

कोपें गरजिली राधा येन काल साप। SKK. p. 27.

कपटें कहिल वड़ायि राधिकार खाने। Do., p. 29.

स्तुतीएँ तुषिल हरि जलेर भितरे। Do., p. 1.

Case ending in ए :

अन उपाये पार ना जाइ। (सरह) p. 58.

किन्तो (=किंतो) मन्ते किन्तो तन्ते किन्तो रे झाण वखाने।

(दारिक) p. 53.

This is also found in Guj.[22], Or.[23], Old Bi., *e.g.*

शिशिरे भीजल पाखी। Vidyāpati, p. 35.

नव कलेवर निज पराभव यश्च भेल विनु काजे। Do., p. 38.

This is the same in Bengali. It is also found in Prākṛta-Pingala-Sūtra, *e.g.* सहजे p. 4, कोहे p. 42, etc.

Dative Case.

Case ending in ए :

काह्न डोम्बी विवाहे चलिआ। (काह्नु) p. 33.

Old Bi. also has this ending, *e.g.*

कमने पुरखे हर अराधिअ। Vidyāpati, p. 51.

Case ending in एरे :

खर रवि किरण सन्तापेरे गअणाङ्गण गइ पइठा। (महीधर) p. 29.

[20] Hem. IV, 333, 342.
[21] Hoernle, p. 230 ; 208 ; Bhandarkar.
[22] Gune, p. 241 ; Beames, Vol. II. 225.
[23] Beames, Vol. II. 225.

Cf. Or. loc. acc. रे,[24] Beng. obj. रे in old Beng. also Pkt., *e.g.*

कृत्तिदास कान्दए कोलेरे ।

Rāmāyaṇa by Kṛttibās.[25]

तवे तारे आमरा अन्य वर चिन्तिल ।

Śrī Kṛṣṇa-vijay, p. 115.[25]

ABLATIVE CASE.

Case ending in हु :

खेपहु जोइनि लेला न जाय । (गुगुरी) p. 9.

रअनहु षहजे कहेइ । (भुसुकु) p. 42.

This is also found in Ap.[26], Old Bi.,

सब फुल मधु मधुर नही फुलहु फुल विसेख । Vidyāpati, p. 62.

In O. Or. हुँ [27]; *e.g.* गीत गोविन्दहुँ (Inscr. of Pratāpa Rudra Deva ; *J. A. S. B.* 1893, p. 96).

Cf. Sin. आउ, अउँ, ऊँ, ओँ, Panj. ओँ, Or. उ.[28]

GENITIVE CASE.

Case ending in क (very rare) :

एडिएउ छान्दक बान्ध करणक पाटेर आस । (लुइ) p. 1.

The same case ending is also found in O. Bi., O. Hin.[29], O. Beng.[30] *e.g.*

नित्यानन्द राय वन्दो रोहिणीक सुत ॥

Caitanya Maṅgal by Locan Dās.

विहारक राजाराणी नामे अम्नावती

Kirāta Parba by Bir Nārāyaṇ.

[24] Beames, Vol. II. p. 263. Hoernle, p. 232.

[25] Communicated by Babu Basanta Ranjan Ray, Lecturer, Calcutta University.

[26] Hem. IV, 336.

[27] Beames, Vol. II. 225, Hoernle, p. 230.

[28] Bhandarkar, p. 205.

[29] Beames, Vol. II, p. 283.

[30] *Śabda Kathā*, p. 108.

গৃহস্থক ধর্ম্ম এহি পুরাণ কহিছে ।

Mahābhārata by Sañjaya.

চাহা চাহা আল বড়ায়ি যমনাক তীরে । ŚKK. p. 307.

Cf. Nai. को,[31] Hin. का, Santali and Mundari *ak*.[32]

Case ending in কে (very rare) :

রূপা থোই মহিকে ঠাবি । (কম্বল) ŚKK. p. 16.

Old Bi. also uses this case ending, *e.g.*

বিপরিব কনক কদলি তর শোভিত থল পঙ্কজকে রূপ রে ।

Vidyāpati.

This is also found in Prākrta-Pingala-Sūtra, *e.g.*

মেচ্ছিঅকে p. 42, etc.

Case ending in র :

সসর সিংগে । (ভুসুকু) p. 63.

হরিণা হরিণির নিলঅ ণ জানী । (ভুসুকু) p. 12, etc.

This is also found in Or.[33], As., O. Beng., *e.g.*

বটর ডালত পাখী বইল উড়াঅ গিয়া ।

Māṇikcandra Rājār Gān, V. S. p. 75.

মোর ঘরর চেলা কোনা সর্ব্বাঙ্গ সুন্দর । Do., p. 77.

আড়অ বাঘর ভয় জলত কুম্ভীর । *Sunya Purāṇ*, p. 55.

This র has been preserved in the dialect of Rangpur in N. Bengal.[34] *Cf.* Mod. Beng. র, এর, Old Bi. রা, *e.g.*

নাহ ন হিঅরা লাগ । Vidyāpati, p. 10.

বচন সুনহ কিছু মোরা । Do., p. 1.

Marwari রো.[35]

[31] Beames, Vol. II. p. 227.

[32] Grierson, Vol. IV. p. 41, 85.

[33] Hoernle, p. 232.

[34] Grierson, Vol. V. 164.

[35] Hoernle, p. 232 ; Beames, Vol. II. 277.

Case ending in रे :

माआ मोह समुदारे अन्त न बुझसि थाहा । (शान्ति) p. 28.

पञ्च विषयरे नायकरे विपख कोवि न देखी । (महीधर) p. 29.

चान्दरे चान्द कान्ति जिम पड़िभासअ । (आर्यदेव) p. 48.

Cf. Santali *reaṅ*, *ran*, *ra*,[36] Mundari *ren*.[37]

Case ending in री :

गिवत गुञ्जरी माली । (शवर) p. 43.

Case ending in एर :

दस्बिर तेन्तलि कुम्भीरे खाअ । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5.

डोम्बी-एर सङ्गे जो जोइ रत्तो । (कान्हु) p. 34, etc.

Case ending in एरा :

शवर राअ मोहेरा बाधा । (दारिक) p. 53.

Case ending in एरि, एरी :

तोहोर अन्तरे मोए घलिलि हाड़ेरि माली । (कान्हु) p. 19.

ता महासुहरी टुटि गेलि कंखा ॥ (ताड़क) p. 56.

It is also found in Old Bi., *e.g.*

नन्दक नन्दन कदम्बेरि तरुतरे । Vidyāpati, p. 1.

नन्देरि नन्दन सञे देखि आवञो । Do., p. 41.

Case ending in एरे :

हाथेरे काङ्काण मा लोउ दापण । (सरह) p. 49.

This is also the case with Old Bi., *e.g.*

आपनि अधिक सुधि

न धर परेरे बधि । Vidyāpati, p. 205.

Locative Case.

No case ending :

दुलि दुहि पिटा धरण न जाइ । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5, etc.

[36] Grierson, IV. p. 41.

[37] Grierson, IV. p. 85.

O. Bi. has the same characteristic, *e.g.*

मेरु उपजल कनक लता । Vidyāpati, p. 8.
तितल बसन तनु लागु । Do., p. 23.
जुगल सैल सिम हिमकर देखल
एक कमल दुइ ज्योतिरे । Do., p. 13.

Case ending in ए :

आलि कालि घण्टा नेउर चरणे । (काह्नु) p. 21.
दुहिल दुधु कि बेण्टे षामाय । (ढेण्ढण) p. 51.

This also occurs in Sanskrit, Pkt., Marwari, Mar., Guj., Sin., Panj., Or., Beng., O. Bi.,[38] *e.g.*

जनि जगे मनसिज भूप रे । Vidyāpati, p. 14.
श्रवणे सोहङ्गम कुण्डल दोले । Do., p. 30.

Case ending in एँ :

सासु घरेँ घालि कोञ्चा ताल । (गुगुरी) p. 9.
उइत्ता गअण माझेँ अदभूआ । (भुसुकु) p. 47.

This is also found in E. Hin.[39] (old Bihari ञ = एँ), *e.g.*

आसाञे मन्दिर निसि गमावए । Vidyāpati, p. 66.
चेतन पापु चिन्ताञे आकुल । Do., p. 67.

Old Bengali, *e.g.*

वन माझेँ पाइल तरासे । SKK. p. 9.

Cf. Mar. ईं, आँ.[40]

Case ending in इ :

दिवसइ बहुड़ी काड़इ डरे भाअ । (कुक्कुरी) p. 5.

It is also found in Ap.[41], O. Guj., Sin.[42]

[38] Bhandarkar pp. 204, 205; Hoernle, p. 208.
[39] Hoernle, p. 242.
[40] Bhandarkar, p. 204.
[41] Hem. IV. 334.
[42] Bhandarkar, pp. 204, 205.

Case ending in हि :

भुसुकु भणइ मूढ़ा हिअहि ण पइसई। (भुसुकु) p. 13.

This also occurs in Ap.[43], Old Bihari, *e.g.*

थावर जङ्गम मनहि अनुमान। Vidyāpati, p. 66.

बन उपवन कुञ्जकुठीरहि सबहि तोहि निरूप। Do., p. 67.

O. Hin.[44]

Case ending in त :

साङ्कमत चड़िले दाहिण वाम मा होही। (चाटिल्ल) p. 11.

The samo case ending is used in As., Old Beng., *e.g.*

काह्न देखि वाटत यमुना थाह्ना दिल। SKK. p. 5.

आमार हाथत किह देह फुल पाने। SKK. p. 14.

क्षुद्र घण्टिका ध्वनि श्रुनि विराजित।
मणियुक्ता काञ्चन ये दोलत पृष्ठत॥

Rājendra Dās, V. S., p. 650.

This is still preserved in the Northern dialect of Bengali,[45] *e.g.*

चिनि चम्पा कला नय जलत माखि खामु।
गाछर फल नय छिड़िया हस्तत दिमु।

Māṇikchandra Rājār Gān, V. S., p. 650.

Cf. Skt. त्र, Old Bengali, *e.g.*

दारुणी वढ़ी तोर वापेत नाइ लाज। SKK. p. 14.

एत बलि विराटेर हातेत धरिया। Sañjaya, V. S., p. 615.

तवे मञि नरकेत पड़िया मरोम।

Śrī Karaṇ Nandī, do., p. 631.

Modern Bengali ते, एते, Panj. ते,[46] Gipsy *te*.[47]

[43] Hem. IV. 341.
[44] Hoernle, p. 207.
[45] Grierson, Vol. V. 164.
[46] Gune, p. 244.
[47] Beames, Vol. II. p. 292.

Case ending in रिँ :

जिम जिम करिणा करिणिरिँ रिसअ। (काह्न) p. 18.

नगर बाहिरि रेँ डोम्बि तोह्नोरि कुड़िया। (काह्न) p. 19.

Cf Or. रे, old Beng. र, रे, एरे,[48]

बाहर काञ्चन बान्धि दिल जय जयकार।

Sūnya Purān, p. 120.

Santali *ra*,[49] Mundari *re*.[50]

Vocative Case.

The same case ending as in the Nom. case :

मारमि डोम्बि लेमि पराण। (कृष्णपाद) p. 19.

Fem. vocatives may be preceded by the interjections.

आलो, हालो, लो, अलो

आलो डोम्बि तोए सम करिबे म साङ्ग। (कृष्ण) p. 19.

हालो डोम्बि तो पुछमि सदभावे। Do.

तु लो डोम्बि हाउँ कपाली। Do.

बाजइ अलो सहि हेरुअ बीणा। (बीणा) p. 30.

Masc. vocative may be preceded by the interjection रे,

सड़ि पडिआँ रे मूढ़ ज भव मानइ। (काह्न) p. 69.

cf. Fem. vocative interjections आल, ल, in old Bengali,

आल राधा पृथिवीत कर अवतार।

थिर हउ सकल संसार। आल राधा॥ ŚKK. p. 6.

आलि आछिदरी राधा ल। Do., p. 21.

In ŚKK. ल is used also before the masc. vocatives

ना थाकिव तोर थाने जाइव आह्मे रोषे।

काह्नाञिँ ल आह्मे तोह्मार दोषे। etc.

[48] Grierson, IV. 41. [49] Grierson, IV. 85, 41. [50] Hoernle, p. 223.

Vidyāpati uses लो both before masc. and fem. vocatives—

वेड़सिह मोहि वड़े सापे
मोरे पापे लो। p. 80.
नृप सिवसिंह रस जाने
नव कान्हे लो। p. 80.

BUDDHA-KĀYA AS AN IDEA

THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF ITS ORIGIN AND GROWTH

BY

RYUKAN KIMURA,

Lecturer in Indian Buddhist History and Mahāyāna Philosophy University of Calcutta.

Buddha's personality was the chief corner-stone of Buddhism. The disciples of Buddha could not do without the personality of Buddha. They deemed it to be a sacred duty to take the name of the founder on their lips both during life and at death. In Buddha's lifetime he was the great teacher in his church, but after his expiration he became the object of refuge. Later on this object of refuge had been raised by the disciples into the Buddha-Kāya theory, whence it began to shuffle off all abstractions and gradually developed into a more concrete form.

The original form of Buddhism, better known as Hinayāna Buddhism could not stretch its eye beyond the conception of Rūpa-kāya Buddha or Historical Buddha, *i.e.* Buddha as born in a human shape and, through the trials of the Eight-fold stages, as having attained to Buddha-hood and as subsequently having entered into Parinirvāṇa. But the developed form of Buddhism, otherwise known as Mahāyāna Buddhism on the contrary conceived beyond Rūpa-kāya a more concrete Buddha in three forms of Dharma-kāya Buddha, Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha and Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha.

In the developed form of Buddhism this Buddha-kāya theory is very important to one who wishes to study Buddhism. I proceed to explain this Buddha-kāya theory under the following heads :—

(*a*) *The meaning of the Tri-kāyas.*

(*b*) *Historical development of the Tri-kāyas.*

(*c*) *Evolution of Tri-kāyas out of the Historical Buddha.*

(*a*) *The Meaning of the Tri-kāyas.*

The term Tri-kāya is a compound of three kāyas. These three kāyas are Dharma-kāya, Saṁbhoga-kāya and Nirmāṇa-kāya. These three elements are not materially different bodies, but are different aspects of the one Buddha. Now let us take each of these three by itself and see what we can learn about it.

(i) *Dharma-kāya Buddha.*

The term Dharma-kāya is the combination of two separate words 'Dharma' and 'Kāya'. In the Mahāyānic sense 'Dharma' is 'Dharma-tathatā' or real substance of the universe, though it has been used sometimes in the sense of 'Law' or 'Doctrine'. The 'Kāya' may be rendered as 'Body' not in the sense of personality but in the sense of the organised totality of things or the principle of cosmic unity though not as a purely philosophical concept, but as an object of religious consciousness. Hence Dharma-kāya Buddha means Buddha who harmonized himself with Dharma-kāya or Dharma-tathatā, regarded as a body of cosmic unity. This notion is just the same as that of the idea of 'Nirguṇa Brahman' in the Upanishads and God-head of Christianity.

(ii) *Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha.*

Among the three Kāyas the conceptions of Dharma-kāya and Nirmāṇa-kāya can be easily comprehended, but that of the Saṁbhoga-kāya is rather difficult to be comprehended. The literal meaning of the term is 'the Body of Bliss'. As soon as Buddha attained enlightenment, his personality was harmonised with Dharma-tathatā or the reality of the universe and as soon as he was harmonized with it the historical

Buddha or the Rūpa-kāya Buddha was transformed into the eternal body just as Dharma-tathatā is and Saṁbhoga-kāya appears as a consequence.

So, in short, Saṁbhoga-kāya is lying partly upon Dharma-kāya and partly upon Rūpa-kāya. In other words when the Historical Buddha or the Rūpa-kāya Buddha was harmonized with the Dharma-tathatā, he was transformed into the absolute personality. As he became identical with that absolute reality or Dharma-tathatā his personality became eternal as regards time and universal as regards space. The Historical Buddha then became the Dharma-tathatā-personified and the Dharma realised. Therefore, we see that Saṁbhoga-kāya is just similar to the idea of 'Saguṇa Brahman' in the Upanishads and the Glory or Holy Ghost of Christianity. According to the Mahāyāna doctrine Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha has two aspects—one for the self-enjoyment, and the other for the enjoyment for the sake of others, as an object, fully religious when we observe these two aspects more minutely we see that the former aspect is only the aspect of self-existence *i.e.*, for the enjoyment of self. When Buddha became harmonized with Dharma-tathatā his personality became Dharmanized, so to speak, I mean, merged in the Dharma itself, and he stood as the absolute one of the universal existence. This is called Dharmanized-personality. In short, the aspect of self-enjoyment is the aspect of Dharmanized-personality.[1] The latter aspect indicates the personification of Dharma[2] when Buddha became harmonized with Dharma-tathatā he was turned into a Tathāgata or Dharma-personified and became a religious object for the Bodhisattvas.

This point has been clearly elucidated by the commentators on Vasubandhu's Vijñaptimātra-siddhi-Śāstra (a treatise on

[1] 'Dharmanized-personality' means the personality within Dharma. This is just the same as the idea of 'Nirguṇa Brahman' in the Upanishads.

[2] 'Personification of Dharma', means 'Dharma-tathatā' within personality. This is just in the same sense as that of 'saguṇa Brahman' in the Upanishads.

the Yogācāra-philosophy) as follows[3]:—

"The Saṁbhoga-kāya has two distinct aspects: (*i*) the body obtained by the Tathāgata for his self-enjoyment, by dint of his religious discipline through aeons; (*ii*) the body which the Tathāgata manifests to the Bodhisattvas in pure land (Sukhāvati)"[4]

The former condition is the personality which is within Dharma-tathatā and this can be seen only by Buddha himself or who possesses some perfect knowledge but never by Bodhisattvas even. The latter condition is the personality which embodies the Dharma-tathatā and this can be seen by Bodhisattvas. But as they possess a degree of knowledge different from that possessed by Buddha they find it in a different shape. So it is not wrong to say that the former represents a pure intellectual perception of Buddha's personality, and that the latter is simply the result of an emotional view of the same.

(iii) *Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha.*

It is literally the Body of Transformation. So Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha means the Historical Buddha. From the religious standpoint of the Mahāyānists this Historical Buddha is regarded as the incarnation of the eternal Tathāgata or the manifestation of the Dharma-tathatā. According to their views, again, the Tathāgata incarnates himself, as required by

[3] This is one of the most important philosophical works of the Yogācāra School. Vasubandhu wrote the text (Nanjio's Catalogue, No. 1215) which consists only of 30 verses. But there arose many commentators, after the death of the author, who naturally entertained widely different views among themselves on the subject-matter, as it is too tersely treated in the text. Hieuen Thsiang made selections out of the ten noted Hindu exegetists in A.D. 659 and translated them into the Chinese language. The compilation consists of 10 fasciculi and is known as Discourses on the Idealty of the Universe (a free rendering of the Chinese title Chang-wei-shi-lun. Nanjio No. 1197), The term 'Vijñaptimātra-siddhi-Śāstra' in Nanjio's Catalogue is stated as 'Vidyamātra-siddhi-Śāstra.' But Nanjio's statement is wrong according to de la Vallée Poussin. Cf. His *Buddhism*, London, 1898, p. 271,

[4] See Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 265.

time and place " for the protection of the good, and for the destruction of the evil-doers," as it is expressed in the Bhagavadgītā :

> paritrāṇāya sādhūnāṁ vināśāya ca duskṛtām,
> dharṁasaṃsthāpanārthāya sambhavāmi yuge yuge.[5]

" For the protection of the good, for the destruction of evil doers, for the sake of firmly establishing righteousness I am born from age to age."

I have explained to you the general meaning of ' Tri-kāyas ' above, one by one.[6] But you should not forget that these three Kāyas are not different from each other but are simply the different aspects of the same personality which was harmonized with the Dharma-tathatā or Absolute reality. It is rather because without Dharma-tathatā the Nirmāṇa-kāya aspect of Buddha cannot come into existence and the Historical Buddha cannot be conceived in his Saṁbhoga-kāya aspect unless he is harmonized with this Dharma-tathatā. Moreover, without Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha or Historical Buddha Dharma-tathatā cannot appear as the Dharma-kāya Buddha or as the Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha being personified with the Historical one. Without Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha, also, the human personality cannot become Buddha after obtaining Dharma-tathatā and the Dharma-tathatā itself cannot appear as the substantial reality of the world. In other words, these Tri-kāyas are just the same as substance, shape and action, of one and the same existence of the same thing. The Dharma-kāya is substance because it exists as substantial reality of the world. The Saṁbhoga-kāya is the shape (of Dharma)

[5] *Bhagavadgītā*, IV, 8.

[6] The parallelism between Buddhism, Hinduism and Christianity :

	Buddhist	Hindu	Christian
(1)	*Dharma-kāya*	*Nirguṇa-Brahma*	*Christ in the Flesh*
(2)	*Saṁbhoga-kāya*	*Saguṇa-Brahma*	*Christ in Glory or the Holy Ghost*
(3)	*Nirmāṇa-kāya*	*Avatāra*	*God-head.*

since it is the personification of Dharma-kāya. The Nirmāṇa-kāya is action (of the Dharma as well as the personality) since the necessity of the world and time requires their births as Avatāras.

Buddha-kāya	Dharma-kāya ..	Substance	Reality with personality.
	Ṣaṁbhoga-kāya...	Shape	
	Nirmāṇa-kāya ...	Action	

(*b*) *A Historical Development of the Tri-kāyas.*

Next we will see that great importance is attached to the study of Tri-kāya from the historical standpoint. We are not in the possession of any historical documents that will throw light on the question as to how early the doctrine of Tri-kāya or Buddhist trinity conception came to be firmly established amongst the Mahāyānists. But we find it in an already developed form as far as our knowledge goes. It was conceived by Asaṅga and Vasubandhu who belonged to the latter part of the fourth cen. A.D., and during the first half of the fifth cen. A.D. Aśvaghoṣa II again tried to conceive it. He flourished about the 5th cen. A.D.[7]

Let us, now, see one by one what are their ideas as incorporated in the Tri-kāya conception.

[7] There is a difference of opinion among the Buddhist scholars about the date of Aśvaghoṣa II. From my point of view there were two Aśvaghoṣas.

(*i*) The first Aśvaghoṣa is contemporary of the Buddhist king Kaniska and flourished towards the beginning of the 2nd cen. A.D. He is the author of *Buddhacarita kaāvya* and *Saundarānanda-kāvya* (Printed in the Bib. Ind. Series by MM. Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasād Sastri, C.I.E., 1910, Calcutta).

(*ii*) The second Aśvaghoṣa is the author of the *Mahāyāna-śraddhotpāda-Śāstra* and his date falls, in my opinion, in the latter part of the fifth cen. A.D. We have no other evidence except that from their works. We can know from his work that the former was regarded as a great poet equal if not superior to Kalidasa, but not a philosopher at all. But the latter, rather, was a philosopher and was equal if not superior to Nāgārjuna. These assertions are corroborated by other evidence also from their works. By minute study of their works we can easily find out the difference of ideas. The *Śraddhotpāda-Śāstra* is full of the highest philosophical ideas while the *Buddhacarita*, etc., contain ideas which are a little beyond the Hinayānic conceptions. From this difference of ideas it can be safely concluded that there were two different Aśvaghoṣas.

Aśvaghoṣa II refers to the Trī-kāya doctrine in a quite developed form in his *Mahāyāna-śraddhotpāda-Śāstra* as follows :—

" Because, all Tathāgatas are the Dharma-kāya itself and at the same time the highest truth (Paramārtha-satya) itself, and have nothing to do with the conditional truth, (Samvṛtti-satya) and compulsory actions ; whereas the seeing, hearing, etc. (*i.e.* the particularising senses), of the sentient being diversified (on its own account) the activity of the Tathāgatas.

" Now this activity (or in other words, the Dharma-kāya) has a twofold aspect. The first one depends on the phenomena-particularising-consciousness, by means of which activity is conceived by the minds of the common people (pṛithakjñāna), Crāvakas, and Pratyeka-Buddhas. This aspect is called the Body of transformation (Nirmāṇa-kāya)." But as the beings of this class do not know that the Body of transformation is merely the shadow (or reflection) of their own evolving-consciousness (pravṛttivijñāna), they imagine that it comes from some external source, and so they give it a corporal limitation. But " the Body of transformation (or what amounts to the same thing, the Dharma-kāya) has nothing to do with limitation and measurement. The second aspect (of the Dharma-kāya) depends on the activity-consciousness (karmavijñāna) by means of which the activity is conceived by the minds of Bodhisattvas while passing from their first aspiration (cittotpada) stage up to the height of Bodhisattva-hood, this is called the Body of Bliss (Saṁbhoga-kāya)."[8]

Asaṅga explained his doctrine of the Trī-kāya in his *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṁkāra-Śāstra* as follows :—

tribhiḥ kāyairmahābodhiṁ sarvākārāmupāgata,
sarvatra sarva satvānāṁkāñkṣacchida namo' stu te.

[8] Aśvaghoṣa's "The Awakening of Faith," by Suzuki, pp. 99-101.

"I salute thee, O Buddha, who art clearer of the doubts of all living beings at every place and who hast acquired the great enlightenment and every kind of knowledge through the threefold body or Kāyas."

The Kārikā elucidates it thus:—

anena tribhiśca kāyaiḥ sarvākārabodhyupagamatvāt sarvajñeyasarvākārejñānācca sarvākārajñatā bhagavataḥ paridīpitā, trayaḥ kāyāḥ svābhāvikaḥ saṁbhogikonairmāṇikaśca.

"This is the Kārikā in which they saluting Buddha have acquired the great Enlightenment and every kind of knowledge and those Tri-kāyas which are—

(*i*) Svābhāvika-kāya (the body of self-existent nature),

(*ii*) Saṁbhogika-kāya (the body of enjoyment),

(*iii*) Nairmāṇika-kāya (the body capable of transformation)."[9]

Vasubandhu's views on the Tri-kāya are just the same as Asaṅga's and these are stated in his Mahāyāna-samparigraha-Śāstra-Vākhyā[10] as follows:—

"By Tri-kāya we understand that his (*i.e.* Buddha's) acquisitions are enlightenment and supreme knowledge and that the Tri-kāyas are—

(*i*) Svābhāvika-kāya
(*ii*) Saṁbhogika-kāya
(*iii*) Nairmāṇika-kāya."[11]

Next let us see what is the doctrine of the Buddha-kāya as revealed by Nāgārjuna, the first Mahāyāna philosopher,

[9] *Mahāyānasūtrālaṁkara-Śāstra* by S. Luis, p. 188, No. 58. This Śāstra was composed by the Bodhisattva Asaṅga and translated by Prabhākaramitra into Chinese about 630-633 A. D. (Thau Dynasty, A. D. 618-907, Nanjio, p. 262, No. 1190).

[10] This is a commentary on Asaṅga's *Mahāyāna-samparigraha-Śāstra* by Vasubandhu. There are three translations of this book in Chinese—

(1) Transl. by Paramārtha, A. D. 563,
(2) Transl. by Dharmagupta, 590,616 A. D.,
(3) Transl. by Hiuen Thsang, 648-649 A. D.

[11] Wang Bundle, Vol. 7, p. 47. Left of Ko-kio-sho-in Tripiṭaka.

who flourished from the latter part of the 2nd cen. A. D. to the beginning of the 3rd cen. A. D.[12] His doctrine on Buddha-kāya is clearly enumerated in his *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-Śāstra*[13] as follows :—

"There are two kinds of Buddha-kāyas—one is the Paramārtha-kāya[14] and the other is Nirmāṇa-kāya; the Paramārtha-kāya of Buddha manifests itself everywhere and shines in every direction (three directions). The sound of his teaching reaches every direction (three directions)—all creatures of the numberless worlds hear his teachings permanently and attain salvation thereby. Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha, here, is not at all different from the Buddha who was born in the royal family and attained Enlightenment after passing through all sorts of sufferings and enjoyments."[15]

This passage leaves no doubt about the fact that Nāgārjuna spoke of only two Kāyas and that his doctrines are against the conception of Buddha-kāya in three different aspects. However, his explanation of the Paramārtha-kāya leads us to believe that it is not different from the Saṁbhoga-kāya. In the Mādhyamika-Śāstra he speaks of Svabhāva-kāya instead of Paramārtha-kāya. So the Paramārtha-kāya of his theory appears to be the same as Dharma-kāya in a sense and again the same as Saṁbhoga-kāya in another sense. From this point it becomes clear that at the time of Nāgārjuna Saṁbhoga-kāya and Dharma-kāya were not yet conceived separately but both of them existed within the Paramārtha-kāya.

Next we come to the Buddha-kāya as conceived by Aśvaghoṣa I.

[12] This date has been accepted generally among the Japanese Buddhist Scholars.

[13] This is a commentary on the *Pañcavin śati-sāhasrika-prajñā-pāramitā*, compiled by Nāgārjuna and translated by Kumārajīva, A. D. 402-405 of the latter Tsin dynasty, A. D. 384-417 (*vide* Nanjio's Catalogue, p. 257, No. 1169).

[14] Paramārtha-kāya is sometimes called Svabhāva-kāya; this is the same as Dharma-kāya. Nāgārjuna deals with Svabhāva-kāya in *Mādhyamika-Śāstra*, Chap. XXII.

[15] Wang Bundle, Vol. 2, p. 51, right hand of Ko-kio-sho-in Tripiṭaka.

I am not in a position at present to quote any passage, from the books of this Aśvaghoṣa I, which may clearly elucidate his opinion on the Buddha-kāya. However, we may be quite sure that his doctrine was the same as that of Nāgārjuna from "A study of the Sūtra on the meaning of the Anātmā in Dharma asked by a Nigrantha jñātaputraḥ."[16] This is the only book, which, again, contains such philosophical ideas of Aśvaghoṣa I as closely resemble those of Nāgārjuna. For example, the ideas of Aśvaghoṣa I about Paramārtha-satya and Saṃvṛtti-satya are similar to those of Nāgārjuna about them. These lead us to conjecture that Aśvaghoṣa's conception of Buddha-kāya was twofold :—

(*i*) Paramārtha-kāya Buddha
(*ii*) Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha.

This conjecture is again not at all baseless. Paramārtha-kāya Buddha is closely connected with Paramārtha-satya and Nirmāna-kāya Buddha with Saṃvṛtti-satya. We cannot say definitely whether Saṁbhoga-kāya aspect of Buddha was conceived by him or not. But it seems quite probable that he did not fail to explain this aspect also in his doctrine.

From historical standpoint we know it clearly that Aśvaghoṣa's doctrine was derived from that of the Mahāsāṅghika school. This is because Pūrṇayaśa belonged to that school and he only transmitted his doctrine to Aśvaghoṣa I. Aśvaghoṣa I, again, in his turn transmitted the doctrine to Nāgārjuna.[17] So it becomes settled beyond doubt that the

[16] The Sūtra or the meaning of the "Anātmā in Dharma" asked by a Nigrantha jñātaputra (Nikhien-tsy-wan-wo-in-kin) is not mentioned in Nanjio's catalogue. It is mentioned in the catalogue of Ko-kio-sho-in tripiṭaka, p. 48, left hand, *vide* Nanji's catalogue, p. xxvi (where the catalogue is mentioned).

[17] There is no historical evidence about the relation between Aśvaghoṣa I and Nāgārjuna. But we can know from their works that Nāgārjuna owed the doctrine to Aśvaghoṣa I. I shall fully deal with this point in the main book.

fundamental doctrines of Nāgārjuna are essentially a further development of the doctrines of Aśvaghoṣa I.

Next let us examine whether any germs of the doctrine of Buddha-kāya can be traced in the views of the eighteen different schools. These eighteen schools, however, are subdivisions of the two principal schools—the Mahāsaṅghika (Great Council) and Sthavira (Elders). These two schools came into being a hundred years after the Buddha's Nirvāṇa in the Vaiśāli Council. The views of these schools are so very complex and intermixed that some of the Elders shared similar views with the adherents of the former school. However they differ in more respects and can be safely distinguished from one another. For the present it will be sufficient if we consider the doctrines of the two schools only. Some passages from the work of Vasumitra will make a clear contribution to the solution of the question in consideration :—

" Discourses on the point of controversy by the different schools of Buddhism follow :—

(1) According to the Mahāsaṅghika :—

" The Buddha's personality is transcendental (lokottara) and all the Tathāgatas are free from the defilements (sāśravaḥ).

(2) " Every word uttered by a Tathāgata has a religious and spiritual meaning and purports to the edification of his fellow-beings—*i.e.*, his one utterance is variously interpreted by his audience each according to his own disposition—but all to his spiritual welfare; every instruction given out by the Buddha is rational and perfect.

(3) " The corporeal body (Rūpa-kāya) of the Buddha has no limits (koti), his majestic power has no limits; every Buddha's life is unlimited; a Buddha knows no fatigue, knows not when to rest, always occupying himself with the Enlightenment of all sentient beings and with the awakening in their hearts of pure faith.

(4) " Buddha has no sleep, no dream.

(5) "As the Buddha is always in the state of deep, exalted spiritual meditation it is not necessary for him to think what to say when requested to answer certain question—though he might appear to the enquirers as if he thoroughly cogitates over the problems presented to him for solution. The Buddha's response is in fact immediate and without any efforts." [1]

Thus the conception of the Buddha-kāya as held by the Mahāsaṅghika school closely resembles those of the Mahāyāna philosophers, as elucidated before. To sum up—the Mahāsaṅghika school looked upon the Buddha from two aspects—from the Nirmāṇa-kāya aspect and from the transcendental aspect, *i.e.*, the Saṁbhoga-Dharma-kāya aspect or in other words from an aspect which is partly Saṁbhoga-kāya and partly Dharma-kāya.

As to the conception of Buddha-kāya as entertained by the Sthavira-vāda school, there are still different opinions among the sub-branches of the Sthavira school but, on the whole, the conception of the Buddha-kāya of that school was not anything beyond the conception of Rūpa-kāya Buddha or the Historical Buddha. There are many controversial points on the subject between the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Sthaviras [19] Let us consider the points of difference between them :—

The Sthaviras say :—

(1) "The Buddha's personality was not free from Bhāvāśrava though his mind was fully Enlightened. His corporeal

[18] Discourse on the points of controversy by the different schools of Buddhism, or "Śāstra on the wheel of the principles of different schools"; in the Chang Bundle, Vol. 4, p. 76, of Ko-kio-sho-in tripiṭaka. There are 3 translations existing in China of the same text—composed by Vasumitra—

(*i*) Shi-pa-pu-lun—Astādasanikāya-Śāstra composed by Vasumitra, translated by Paramārtha, A. D. 557-569.

(*ii*) Pu-chi-hi-lun Nikāya-avalamvana-Śāstra (Śāstra on the difference of the view of 18 Hinayāna schools). This translation is similar to above.

(*iii*) I-pu-tsan-lun-lun Nikāya-bhada-dharmamati-chakra-Śāstra (Śāstra on the wheel of the principles of different schools) composed by Vasumitra, translation by Hiuen Thung, 662, A.D.

[19] Cf. Kathāvatthu and Vasumitra's discourses on the points of controversy by the different schools of Buddhism.

existence was the product of blind love veiled with ignorance and tangled with attachment. If this were not so, the Buddha's feature would not have awakened an impure affection in the heart of a maiden, an ill-will in the heart of a highwayman, stupidity in the mind of an ascetic and arrogance in that of a haughty Brāhmaṇa. These incidents which happen during the life of Buddha evince that his corporeal presence was apt to agitate other's heart, and to that extent it was contaminated by Bhāvāśrava." [20] This is said as a refutation of the first point of the Mahāsaṅghikas enumerated before.

(2) "Every word uttered by a Buddha has not a religious meaning. The Buddha occasionally uttered things which had nothing to do with the enlightenment of others; that even with the Buddha something was out of his attainment, for instance, he could not make every one of his hearers perfectly understand his preaching; that though the Buddha never taught anything irrational and heretical, yet all his speeches were not perfect." [21] This is a refutation of the second point.

(3) As regards the third point, deifying the Historical Buddha of Mahāsaṅghikas the Sthaviras refute it thus—

"The Buddha limits and can never be beyond the historical one, and though he has majestic power but that power is limited—there is beginning and end in his life." [22]

(4) Against the fourth point they say—

"The Buddha never dreams because he has cut off evil ideas but he has sleep." [23]

(5) Against the fifth point they say—

"The Buddha has mental calculation as to how to express his ideas as best suited to the understanding of the audience.

[20] Mahā-vibhāsā Vol. 173 in the Shan bundle, Vol. 7, p. 3; right of Ko-kio-sho-in tripiṭaka.

[21] Vasumitra's same work—as existed in the Chang bundle, Vol. 4, p. 77, left of Ko-kio sho-in tripiṭaka.

[22] Bukkyo-tou-itsu-Ron, Vol. III, pp. 227-237, by Dr. S. Mura-kami.

[23] Vibhāsa, Vol. 37, in the Shan bundle, Vol. 2, p. 51 right of Ko-kio-sho-in tripiṭaka.

Indeed he does not cogitate over the problem itself for with him everything is transparent, but he thinks over the best method of presenting his ideas before his pupils."[24]

From the above question we can easily understand that the conception of the Buddha-kāya as entertained by the Sthavira school is quite original and does not surpass the Rūpa-kāya aspect. Thus far we have succeeded in tracing historically the theory of Buddha-kāya as developed in different schools.

(c) *Evolution of Tri-kāyas out of the Historical Buddha.*

There seems to have been two ways in which the Buddha-kāya conception developed into the Tri-kāya. According to the first method, the doctrine of Buddha-kāya came to exist, and developed into Tri-kāya through the emotional faith of the Buddha's disciples, and according to the second view, it developed through the instrumentality of philosophical speculation among his disciples.

Let us see what these two methods have got to teach us on the point.

(i) In the Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra it is stated that when Buddha passed away from the world many of his disciples wept and cried, " How soon the light of the world has passed away."[25]

Though it has been described in the Sūtra that those of the brethren who were not then free from passions wept and uttered those words yet I think that such kinds of utterances and weepings will happen naturally with the force of human emotions to all disciples, irrespectively of whether they were possessed of passions or not.

This emotional utterance on the part of the disciples of the Buddha may here be reckoned as the important step to the building up and development of the doctrine of the Buddha-kāya.

[24] Mr. K. Terazima's commentary on Vasumitra's I-pu-tsun-lun-lun, p. 651 and p. 85.
[25] Digha-nikāya ii. 158, the Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, p. 177.

After the death of the Buddha the disciples who had been his constant attendants in his lifetime began to revoke the august personality of the past Master and this retrospective had filled them with great delight in such a manner that they broached themselves in the following Sutta :—

"Exalted one, a Supremely awakened one, Perfect in knowledge, and in conduct, an Auspicious one, a Knower of all the worlds, an Incomparable guide to men who desire guidance, a Teacher of Gods and men, an Awakened one, a Blessed one ;"[26]

Again those disciples who entered into the Buddhist community, now hearing of Buddha's personality began to long for the past personality of the great Buddha. This is clear from the following passage :—

"If we hear that we would be able to see Buddha Bhagavān we should go ten yojanas, twenty yojanas, thirty yojanas, even one hundred yojanas and one thousand yojanas to pay respect to Bhagavān. But Buddha is no more ; so we shall take refuge in the Buddha who has attained Parinirvāṇa and in the Dharma and in the Saṁgha."[27]

Though just at the time of his Parinirvāṇa Buddha instructed his disciples to regard 'Dharma', 'Vinaya' as their

[26] Majjhima-nikāya, Hatthipadopama-Sutta (Vol. I, p. 179)—this translation I quote from Discourses of Gotama the Buddha by Silācāra, Vol. II, p. 25, and the same statements we can get from many utterances as follows :—

Majjhima-nikāya Raṭṭhapala (Vol. II, p. 55).
,, Taṇhāsaṇkhaya (Vol. I, p. 67).
,, Brahmāyu (Vol. II, p. 133).
,, Salayoka (Vol. I, p. 285).
,, Apaṇṇaka (Vol. I, p. 401).
Digha-nikāya Ambaṭṭha 1·2 (Vol. I, p. 87).
,, Sonadaṇda 1. (Vol. I, p. 111).
,, Kūṭadanta 1·2 (Vol. I, p. 127-8).
,, Tevijja 7. (Vol. I, p. 236).
,, Lohicca 3. (Vol. I. p. 225).
,, Mahali I. (Vol. I, p. 85).
Saṁyutta-nikāya xxii. 78 (Vol. III, p. 85).

Such pleasing words were also uttered by the disciples to Buddha even in his lifetime.

[27] Majjhima-nikāya, Madhura-Sutta, Vol. II, p. 90.

teacher after his death[28] and at the same time advised them to take refuge in Dharma, Saṁgha and Self,[29] yet the disciples could not rest satisfied without the personality of Buddha among the refuges of Tri-Ratna. In his lifetime the objects of faith were Buddha, Dharma and Saṁgha to the disciples, and among these three, Buddha stood at the centre. But after his death though his place was taken by Dharma in the doctrine of Tri-Ratna, yet the emotional feelings of his disciples could not make them remain satisfied without the personality of Buddha as the object of refuge as before.

Because if we look into the historical traces of the objects of refuge in place of Buddha, we will find at least three kinds of such objects namely, (*i*) worship of Scriptures, (*ii*) worship of the formulated Tri-Ratna form, (*iii*) worship of Buddha's relics. From this it is apparent that some days after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa the disciples could not control their emotional feelings in the absence of the Buddha's personality among them so they searched for some equivalents in the place of the Buddha which must be connected with the past Buddha; and they found out their objects of refuge. So some of them began to take refuge in Scriptures, some of them began to resort to the formula of the Tri-Ratna. Such emotional sentiments of Buddha's disciples were quite natural.

Here let us see how the above three things became their objects of refuge :—

(*i*) The Scriptures are revelations of Buddha. His perfect knowledge, character, and his great personality must have consequently existed within the scriptures; and moreover it was declared by Buddha himself that after his death only the doctrines of his promulgation (including the Vinaya) should

[28] Digha-nikāya ii, p. 134, dialogues of the Buddha, by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, p. 171.

[29] Digha-nikāya ii, p. 109, Dialogues of the Buddha, by Rhys Davids, Vol. III. pp. 105-6, and Majjhima-nikāya, Ċulasihanāda-Sutta, Vol. I, p. 64.

lead men to salvation.[30] This is the reason why some of his disciples began to take refuge in them in place of the Buddha.

(*ii*) The three Ratnas had been in existence as objects of refuge during the lifetime of the Buddha and after his demise they were also made objects of refuge. About these things we come to understand clearly from early Indian Buddhist scriptures at the time of Aśoka and some time also after that, and such worship is clearly shown in the Sutta :—

"Buddha is no more, we shall take refuge then in the Buddha who has already obtained Parinirvāṇa and in the Dharma and in the Saṁgha.[31]

(*iii*) Buddha's relics had been worshipped by his disciples in reverential commemoration and cogitation of the great personality of the Buddha.

(*a*) Among the relics it seems that the worship of Buddha's remains occupied the most important place. In the Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sutta it is stated that after Buddha's death his remains had been divided in eight parts of the country. From Indian Buddhist sculpture and literature we come to learn that these remains had been worshipped [32] from early time and that the worship of Buddha's remains was much in vogue in India at the time of king Aśoka.

(*b*) In the next place the Stūpa also had been created in places where Buddha's remains had been enshrined, after Buddha's death, and for some time Stūpas had been built as memorial signs in those places where Buddha was born. Buddha had attained Supreme knowledge, where the first kingdom of Righteousness had been set on foot and where Buddha had obtained his Parinirvāṇa.[33]

[30] Ānanda, the Dharma and Vinaya which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you. (Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, Vol. III, p. 171).

[31] Majjhima-nikāya, Madhura-Sutta, Vol. II, p 90.

[32] Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, pp. 190-1.

[33] Digha-nikāya Mahāparinibbāṇa-Suttanta, ii. 140'8.
Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, p. 153.

Therefore, the Stūpa had been reverenced equally with the remains. But in later ages these Stūpas were gradually reverenced by the Buddhists more and more than the relics as objects of worship. Not only this, but even the Buddhists thought that this kind of worship entailed great merits, so that in its consequence Stūpa worship prevailed largely in India at the time of Aśoka. Tradition tells us that the great king Aśoka erected 84,000 Stūpas.[34] In I-pu-tsun-lun-lun we find there are discussions upon the 'worship of Stūpa' among the Caityaśaila, Mahiśāsaka with Dharmaguptika, the Caitya-śaila of Mahāsaṅghika branch; and the Mahiśāsaka of Sthavira branch hold the same opinions that the Stūpa-worship gives no effect but Dharmaguptika of Sthavira branch hold to the contrary that Stūpa-worship gives much effect.[35]

(c) Next, the worship of the Bodhi tree and worship of Buddha's foot-print were also among the relic-worship.

Thus after Buddha's death or Buddha's passing away some of the disciples worshipped those relics as objects of refuge. But as time went by, the emotional feeling of disciples became deeper and they could not hold themselves in restraint from yearning after the Buddha's personality. So some of them began to dwell in comfort against the advent of the future Buddha, because in his lifetime Buddha had spoken many a time about the past and future Buddhas. In the Mahāpadāna-Sutta Buddha spoke about the past six Buddhas :—

Vipassi, Sikhi, Vessabhu, Kakusandha, Konāgamana Kassapa[36]: "Ahesuṁ atītaṁ addhānaṁ arahantā sammā-sambuddhā te pi bhagavanto etū paramaṁ yena sammā bhikkhusaṅghaṁ paṭipādesuṁ seyyathā pi bhagavanto

[34] Vincent A. Smith, Early History of India, p. 114.

[35] I-pu-tsun-lun-lun with K. Terajima's commentary, Tayo-daigaku edition, pp. 117, 157, 158.

[36] D. N. ii, 2. Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, pp. 6-7.
S. N., Vol. 4 (Vol. ii, pp. 5-9).
S. N., VI. 2. 4. (Vol. I, pp. 155-7).

etaṁparamaṁ yena samma bhikkhusaṅghaṁ patipodesuṁ seyyathā pi etarahi mayā sammā bhikkhusaṅgho patipādito: ye pi te kandaraka bhanissanti anāgataṁ addhānaṁ arahanto sammā sambuddhā te pi bhagavanto etā paramaṁ yena sammā bhikkhu saṅghaṁ paṭipādessanti." [37]

"Just as in the past those who were supremely Enlightened had established supreme Saṁghas, even so I have established a supreme Saṁgha at the present time. Those that will be supremely Enlightened ones in the future will establish supreme Saṁghas even as I have established it now." [38]

This is the reason why some of the disciples got the idea of the future Buddha. The future Buddha was not equal with the past great Buddha, so their faith for the future Buddha could not satisfy them well. At last some of the disciples came to know the Dharma for ever because

"Paccaya, yena Tathāgato parinibbute saddhammo ciraṭṭika hoti." [39]

"Though Buddha entered into Parinirvāṇa by some condition (paccaya) but Dharma is for ever."

And at the same time they came to know that Buddha's personality was identical with Dharma, because Buddha declared :—

"Dhammaṁ hi so bhikkhu passati
Dhammaṁ passanto maṁ passati"

"One who perceives Dharma can see me and one who understands me, can know Dharma." [40]

Thus they began to identify Buddha's personality with eternal Dharma, and eternal Dharma with Buddha's personality and at last their faithful initiation gave them to understand that Rūpa-kāya Buddha was identified with Dharma-kāya

[37] Majjhima-nikāya, Vol. I, p. 339.

[38] This translation has been rendered by my learned friend Prof. Sailendranath Mitra, M.A.

[39] A. N., VI. 40 (Vol. III, p. 340).

[40] Itivuttaka 92 (p. 21).

and they created what is called Dharma-kāya Buddha. Here Rūpa-kāya Buddha was transformed into Dharma-kāya Buddha. Thus the so-called Dharma-kāya Buddha came into existence.

In Buddha's lifetime there were many disciples and even outsiders who were so much captivated by the Buddha's great personality that they began to call Buddha with such pleasing words like Sugata (the happy one), Bhagavā (the blessed one), Loka-nātha (the lord of the world), Sarvajña (omniscient), Dharmarāja (king of Righteousness), etc.; and such disciples, after Buddha's Parinirvāṇa, began to please his past great personality more highly and more mythologically—Buddha possessed 32 great personal marks and 80 different features, etc.[41] Such mythological conceptions should take place naturally among any religious community in the way of commemorating their leader after his death. This is the same case with our Buddhist Community. From observation of the Dharma-kāya conception connected and harmonized with mythological personality of the Buddha they created what is called Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha, because their emotional feelings led them to believe that Buddha is permanent and at the same time they were inclined to combine this belief with the Buddha's personality. So with mythological personality they personified the Dharma which is permanent and with this permanent Dharma they Dharmanized that personality. Thus they established Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha who is a permanence as well as a personality. In this way the emotional feeling of Buddha's disciples developed Rūpa-kāya Buddha into Dharma-kāya and Dharma-kāya into Saṁbhoga-kāya.

Next, let us see how Buddha-kāya came to exist and had developed into the Tri-kāya through the philosophical speculations of the disciples.

In his lifetime Buddha preached for the common mass such doctrines which dealt only with the apparental world,

[41] In the Nikāya we have many passages which deal such highly pleasing words.

and he indicated to the people that "All is impermanent," "All is suffering;" "All is non-Ego," because thereby he wanted to lead the people to the way to salvation directly, and hence he tried his level best to reject philosophical discourses which would easily take the people into useless speculations and would hardly lead them to salvation.

But his introspectional perception was on the other side busy with quiet ontological truth which had been indicating that "All is permanent," "All is happy," and "All is in the universal Mahātmā (not in the Brahmanical sense)."[42]

Some disciples of Buddha possessed much advanced understanding so that they might understand Buddha's introspectional perception.

About Buddha's death there were at least three kinds of conceptions among his disciples—some of the disciples who had no advanced knowledge thought that Buddha would die just like other human mortals. So in the Mahāparinibbāṇa-Suttanta it is stated thus :—

"Sabbe ' va nikkhipissanti bhūtā loke samussayaṁ;
Yathā etādiso satthā loke appaṭipuggalo
Tathāgato balappatto sambuddho parinibbuto "[43]

[42] Here is room enough to speak something to Buddha's Dharma. The Dharma means the doctrine of Buddha or the perception of Buddha, and in this perception there are two aspects, because when Buddha attained Enlightenment under the Bodhi tree he at once penetrated both the aspects of this world ; one is the perception upon the world as it appears and the other is the perception upon the reality of the world. The former may be called Phenomenological preception and the latter may be called Ontological perception of this world. And Buddha preached in his lifetime mainly the former conception for the common mass, because his aim was to save more the common mass than others in comparison and at the same time his aim was to lead them by the direct way to salvation. It was necessary therefore, for him to indicate the condition of this apparental Saṁsāra as full of suffering and misery. For this kind of indication men had naturally to direct their attention to religious faith and righteous conduct. But the latter perception was quite contrary, being mainly concerned with the reality of the world, and from this point of view the world and all beings are not impermanent but permanent, not suffering but happy. There is no individual atom but we all are in Mahātmā. Such introspectional perception is clearly stated in the Saddharmapuṇḍarika-Sūtra in complete form and in the Pāli Nikāya in a scattered form. You should mind here that the so-called idea of Upanishad existed in the Buddha's introspectional perception.

[43] D, N. ii. 157, Dialogues of the Buddha by Rhys Davids, Vol. III, p. 175,

"They all, all beings that have life, shall lay aside their complex form—that aggregation of mental and material qualities,

That give them, or in heaven or on earth
Their fleeting individuality!
E'en as the teacher being such a one,
Unequalled among all the men that are,
Successor of the prophets of old time,
Mighty by wisdom, and in insight clear,—
hath died!"

And some disciples who possessed a little advanced understanding thought that Buddha would die and that Buddha would live for ever because, they say, Buddha's personality is beyond any knowledge. In the Aggivacchagotto-Sutta it is stated thus :—

"Tathāgato gambhīro appameyyo
duppariyogāhī sayyathāpī mahāsamuddo
upapajjatīti na upeti, na upapajjatīti na upeti"

"Tathāgata is like a deep ocean; it cannot be measured; and it cannot be weighed; so it should not be agreeable to say whether Buddha will live for ever or not."[44]

But the much advanced disciples understood that Buddha's personality was permanent for ever and knew that though Buddha took Parinirvāṇa yet he could live for ever.[45] So in the Saddharmapuṇḍarika-Sūtra

"Tāvaccirābhisaṁbuddho aparimitāyuṣparamaṇaṁ tathāgataḥ sadā sthītaḥ. Aparinirvṛitastathāgataḥ parinirvaṇamādarśayati vaineyavaśena."

"Without being extinct, the Tathāgata makes a show of extinction, on behalf of those who have to be educated."[46]

[44] M. N. Aggivacchagotto (Vol. I, p. 488).

[45] On going for pleasure or vihāra sūtra in D. N. of Chinese Tripiṭaka No. 9 of Cheh bundle of Ko-kio-sho-in, pp. 22 ff., this verse did not exist in the Pali Mahāparinibbāṇa suttanta.

[46] S. P. Sūtra, p. 319, S. B. E., Vol. XXI, p. 302.

The reason is that they understood that Buddha's personality is already identified with Dharma because

"Dharmaṁ hi so bhikkhu passati
Dhammaṁ passanto maṁ passati"

"One who perceives dharma, can see me and one who understands me can know Dharma."[47]

And Dharma itself is beginningless and endless so Buddha's personality should also be without a beginning and an end. In this way those advanced disciples, as soon as they met Buddha's Parinirvāṇa, at once established the Dharma-kāya Buddha. The Dharma-kāya Buddha is rather an abstract form, and such a form could not satisfy the disciples in their religious observances. So they again established Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha out of Dharma-kāya Buddha. In this process they harmonized Dharma-kāya with mythological activities of Buddha which were prevalent at that time among the disciples, and thus they transformed the abstract Dharma-kāya into Saṁbhoga-kāya which is quite concrete in form.

In the Saddharmapuṇḍarika-Sūtra it is stated as follows:—

"Na cāpi nirvāmyahu tasmi kāle
ehaiva co dharmu prakāśayāmi"

"I do not become extinct at the time, and in this very place continue preaching the law."[48]

In the next place it is a quite necessary problem to explain the growth of the Historical Buddha. If Buddha's personality exists as Dharma-kāya in Dharma which is permanent and at the same time exists as Saṁbhoga-kāya Buddha in universal form which is also permanent how should we then explain the existence of the Historical Buddha who had been moulded into a human form.

[47] Itivuttaka 92, p. 21.
[48] Saddharmapuṇḍarika, p. 323. S. B. E., Vol. XXI, p. 307.

To answer this question the disciples created incarnation idea, and they thought that Buddha's personality is beginningless and endless indeed, but whenever necessary it comes out in human shape as an Avatāra, as a teacher. This is what is called in Buddhism Nirmāṇa-kāya Buddha.

In this way they established Dharma-kāya, Saṁbhoga-kāya and Nirmāṇa-kāya.

On the whole I have shown above something about the development of the Tri-kāya Buddha from emotional as well as philosophical points of view.

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL